

JPRS 84153

19 August 1983

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1448

Selections from Soviet Foreign Policy Journals



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

19 August 1983

USSR REPORT
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS
No. 1448

SELECTIONS FROM SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY JOURNALS

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Table of Contents for April 83 Issue of Soviet Journal on Latin American Studies (LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 4, Apr 83)..... | 1 |
| Polemics on Nature of, Proper Response to Dictatorships Surveyed (A. F. Shul'govskiy; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 4, Apr 83)..... | 3 |
| Soviet-Cuban Book on Cuban Army Reviewed (Ye. A. Larin; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 4, Apr 83)..... | 18 |
| Institute Book on Regional States' Foreign Policy Reviewed (A. I. Kedrov; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 4, Apr 83)..... | 21 |
| Institute Conference on Struggle Against Reformism Held (Z. V. Ivanovskiy; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 4, Apr 83)..... | 25 |
| Institute Conference on U.S. Military Policy in Region Held (V. N. Nikolayev; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 4, Apr 83)..... | 30 |
| Contents Listed for May 83 Issue of Soviet Journal on Latin American Studies (LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 5, May 83)..... | 34 |
| Shul'govskiy Edits Book on Political, Social Systems (A. I. Stroganov; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 5, May 83)..... | 36 |
| Book Surveying Agrarian Reforms Reviewed (M. V. Kulakov; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 5, May 83)..... | 40 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Jubilee Institute Session Discusses Soviet-Latin America Ties (LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 5, May 83)..... | 42 |
| Changing U.S. Attitudes to East-West Relations in 1970's Explained (Nikolay Ivanovich Lebedov, Sergey Vadimovich Kortunov; NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA, No 3, May-Jun 83)..... | 45 |
| Book on Domestic Politics of U.S. 'Turn to Confrontation' Reviewed (R. F. Ivanov; NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA, No 3, May-Jun 83)..... | 60 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR APRIL 83 ISSUE OF SOVIET JOURNAL ON LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 4, Apr 83 pp 3-4

[Table of Contents for No 4, Apr 83 issue of LATINSKAYA AMERIKA]

[Text] A.F. Shul'govskiy. The State and the Struggle for Democracy 5

A. Mendez Cruz (Cuba). Foreign Capital and the Problems of Industrializing the Latin American Countries 22

Meetings, Interviews

Chile: The People's Offensive Is Not to Be Stopped (conversation with underground communists) [For Text see Latin American Political Report] 31

On the 70th Birthday of Rodney Arismendi

S.Y. Mikoyan. Thinker, Fighter, Person 55

Art and Literature

L.A. Kaluzhenina (Minsk). "Alef" and Others 67

Publications

From the Archives of David Vygodskiy (final installment) 74

From the Notebook of a Journalist

S.V. Sychev. The Aborigines of Panama 94

Translation, Abstracts

In Memory of the Great Patriot of Panama, General Omar Torrijos (summary of a book by Romulo Escobar Bethancourt: "Torrijos: 1 Colonia Americana! No!" [Torrijos: To an American Colony: No!]) 108

The Book Shelf

| | |
|---|-----|
| Ye. A. Larin. "Muzhestvo i bratsvo" [Courage and Fraternity], edited by I.N. Shkadov, P.A. Zhilin, T. Bornot Pubillones and V.V. Vol'skiy, Voenizdat, Moscow, 1982 | 130 |
| A.I. Kedrov. "Vneshnyaya politika stran Latinskoy Ameriki" [The Foreign Policy of the Latin American Countries], Chief editors A.N. Glinkin and A.I. Sizonenko, "Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", Moscow, 1982 | 132 |
| S.A. Baburkin. G. Pope Atkins: "Arms and Politics in the Dominican Republic," Boulder, Colorado, Westview press, 1981 | 134 |
| I.I. Krastilevskiy. N.D. Lutskov: "Okkupatsiya Gaiti Soyedinennymi Shatami 1915-1934" [The U.S. Occupation of Haiti 1915-1934], "Nauka", Moscow, 1981 | 136 |
| Scholarly Life | |
| Z.V. Ivanovskiy. Reformism in the Workers Movement | 138 |
| V.N. Nikolayev. Latin America and the Military Policy of the USA | 141 |
| Copyright: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1983 | |

8543

CSO: 1807/291

POLEMICS ON NATURE OF, PROPER RESPONSE TO DICTATORSHIPS SURVEYED

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 4, Apr 83 pp 5-21

[Article by A.F. Shul'govskiy: "The State and the Struggle for Democracy"]

[Text] The present stage in the struggle for democracy in the bourgeois countries of Latin America is characterized by the increasingly active participation in the democratic process by representatives of the broadest spectrum of political and social forces, which put forward various political plans as alternatives to the plans of the most extremist factions of the ruling classes. Despite obvious differences in their positions, favorable opportunities exist for the strengthening of unity in the course of the struggle against the fascist reaction. In this regard, it is essential to have criticism of those theories and ideas, which cast doubt upon or generally deny the opportunity to achieve success by means of cooperation among democratic forces.

The "emergency" or "anti-guerrilla" state: the struggle for alternative ways of social development

In recent years the thesis that the ruling classes of the Latin American countries are interested in perpetuating the "emergency" state has received a certain amount of currency. According to this viewpoint, the state functions on the basis of repressive-terrorist legislation, without aiming to strengthen the domination of the ruling class by means of a policy of social maneuvering.

Some adherents of this position claim that the sense and essence of the present stage in the struggle of the Latin American peoples amounts to a dilemma: fascism or socialism. Further, they proceed from the notion that the ever greater degree to which the ruling classes in these countries are integrated into the world capitalist system supposedly leads almost inevitably to their aspirations becoming fascist in nature because fascism is the only means of preserving the positions of the local monopolistic bourgeoisie, which enters into an alliance with the multi-national corporations. Hence, in their opinion, the aspiration of the counterrevolutionary bloc to create a fascist type of totalitarian state. The conclusion of those who adhere to this concept amounts to the view that a policy of socialist revolution can interfere with the dissemination of fascism in Latin America. In the opposite case, as claimed, for example, by the Chilean publicist Armando Cassigoli,

the Peruvian sociologist Anibal Cijano, and the Brazilian economist and political scientist T. Dos Santos, it all amounts to only external, cosmetic changes in the existing system, which gives rise to fascism imminently.¹

A somewhat different viewpoint has been put forward recently. Its supporters, who include those who in general deny the existence of the fascist threat in Latin America, claim that the "emergency" state (a kind of hypostasis of a state which has been made into a satellite--A. Sh.), has already been institutionalized in the region, moreover, it exists under any political regimes, which do not hinder it. They explain the aspiration to maintain at any cost the "emergency" state with reference to the fact that the Latin American bourgeoisie cannot maintain its dominance any more without resorting to a policy of open violence and terror.

The Brazilian sociologist Ruis Marini provides support for this viewpoint. He claims that an "anti-guerrilla" state (an analogue of the "emergency state--A.Sh.) has been virtually created in all the countries of the continent. In determining its essence, Ruis Marini writes that it is a "corporativistic state of the monopolistic bourgeoisie and the armed forces, regardless of the form which it takes. In other words, regardless of the political regime." This thesis is grounded in the existence of a kind of "consensus" of all groups and factions of the bourgeoisie on the issue of its need for an "anti-guerrilla" state. Although the monopolistic bourgeoisie is the dominating faction in the state, its non-monopolistic groups are also interested in supporting it, because "it defends those foundations of the dominance and exploitation, thanks to which they also exist."²

Inasmuch as the propagandists of the theory about the "emergency" state lay claim to a theoretical elaboration of the fundamental problems of strategy and tactics of the revolutionary struggle, it is not surprising that an acute ideological controversy has arisen around the theses and postulates which they have put forward. The opponents of this viewpoint criticise its supporters for the fatalism of the initial premises, the over-simplification of their judgements and prognoses and for their vulgaristic formulation of the problem concerning the moving forces of revolutionary transformations.

The Chilean Marxist scholar Manuel Fuensalida argues with those who advance the thesis that it is inevitable that a capitalist state will adopt a fascist aspect in the interests of accelerating the process of capital accumulation; he considers it wholly logical and natural to conclude that this process leads to the formation and development of a state monopoly capital system. However, the type of state forms within which the system will be developed depends on the conditions and features of the class struggle in each individual country. "Naturally," he noted, "as V.I. Lenin has already written, the strengthening of the reaction 'along all lines' is characteristic of the development of state monopolistic capitalism. However, as with any tendency, its actual implementation from the viewpoint of scale, rate and depth will depend in the final analysis on the concrete conditions and alignment of forces."³

The Uruguayan publicist Fernando Miraballes also criticizes those who claim that the modernization of capitalism in Latin America inevitably leads to the

establishment of a fascist form of rule. "Why," he asks not without reason, "does the process of the development and consolidation of state monopoly capitalism in many countries (including a number of Latin American states, for example Mexico and Venezuela) not bring with it the establishment of a fascist type of state? Does the process of the consolidation of the highest forms of capitalism in the area of economics inevitably lead to the creation of a fascist political superstructure? The answer can only be negative." In the words of Fernando Mirabelles, this type of viewpoint obviously belittles the opportunities for struggle by the popular masses, who are trying to foil the plans of the counterrevolutionary forces.⁴

The thesis about the existence of a "consensus" of all the groups and factions of the bourgeoisie on the question of needing to preserve the "emergency" state has also been subjected to criticism. For example, the Brazilian sociologist Emiliano Jose thinks that this approach does not take into account existing disagreements in the ranks of the bourgeoisie, and it underestimates the desire of certain bourgeois groups to apply flexible political methods with regard to the masses in order to provide for its own hegemony in society by means of more reliable means. For this reason the thesis about the existence of consensus on the issue of the "emergency" state among all strata of the bourgeoisie naturally leads to the conclusion that the only way to do away with the dictatorship of the reactionary forces is to make a "frontal assault by the popular masses."⁵

The role of the working class in the liberation processes and the struggle for democracy is one of the central questions in the polemic which has developed. Adherents of the "emergency" state theory essentially put forward the thesis of "proletarian vanguardism," without even posing the question of the working class gaining the role of hegemon in society; unless this is done, it is impossible to create the preconditions for profound social, anti-imperialist transformations with an orientation toward socialism. It is no accident that the question of ways for the working class to gain hegemony occupies a key place in the statements made in the spirit of "proletarian vanguardism" by opponents with all kinds of views. Luis Corvalan writes in this regard: "The Communist Party is convinced that the leading role of the working class cannot be achieved by means of lyrical speeches or naive demands to recognize this role in words; it can only be gained in the struggle, by means of constant and persistent efforts aimed at interpreting reality correctly and expressing the real interests of the majority of the population."⁶

The importance of using progressive forces to work out the kind of strategy and tactics which would create the conditions for uniting broad strata of the population around the working class in the struggle for renewed democracy is becoming ever greater, and various political forces are putting forward alternatives to the plans of the rightist authoritarian regimes.

The theory of "peripheral capitalism," which was developed by Raul Prebisch has aroused great public response and debate recently. The founder of the "ECLA school" (UN Economic Committee on Latin America) is largely revising his views concerning the ideas of the state of "universal prosperity," which

is based on principles of "social harmony" and institutions of "representative democracy." Prebisch recognizes that this type of approach erred in terms of over-simplification and economism because it ignored the social aspects of societal development. According to Prebisch, the democratic institutions in the Latin American countries proved to be extremely fragile, and in a number of states--and frequently in the most developed ones--they were replaced by authoritarian regimes, which were in the interests of the privileged groups of the population.

On the basis of criticism of the mechanism by which the "peripheral capitalism" of Latin America functions, Prebisch writes that the myth which said that it was possible for the countries in this region to follow the models of "industrial centers" has been debunked. The development of these states has proven the illusory nature of the hopes that the spread of capitalism "of the centers" on a "planetary" scale would have a beneficial influence. In fact, capitalism "of the centers" acts as an all-engulfing force, which aspires to total domination and which deforms the development of the "peripheral" countries. Prebisch criticized sharply the neoliberal dogmas of the "Chicago school," emphasizing that they met the interests of only a privileged minority of the local bourgeoisie and the multi-national corporations. The policy which is carried out on the basis of these dogmas dooms the masses of the population, in Prebisch's words, to unemployment and poverty.⁷

Prebisch thinks that the process by which social injustice in society is intensifying can be eliminated by creating a strong and authoritative state, which bases its activities on a common interest in the just distribution of property and the desire to overcome the negative consequences of the free play of market forces. A state of this kind is interpreted as being a state which is "above classes," and capable of transforming the mechanisms of social relations in the spirit of "social harmony" and cooperation among all social forces. It is no accident that Prebisch appeals so consistently to church circles, the military, entrepreneurial and bureaucratic-technocratic elite to take account of the sad experience of the authoritarian system of rule and to support plans for creating a democratic state of the new type.

The concept of "peripheral capitalism" is not free of obvious contradictions and weaknesses in its reasoning, and attention has been directed to this fact by representatives of progressive public opinion who have paid their dues to the democratism of the views and convictions held by the patriarch of Latin American economic thought. In his theory Prebisch in essence does not touch upon the question of production relations and the profound reasons for the antagonism between labor and capital. Prebisch introduced the idea of "economic surplus," and he explains its appearance with reference to the growing influence of "technological progress" on the Latin American countries. This concept reduces the reasons for the dysfunctionality of "peripheral capitalism" only to the incorrect effect of the distribution mechanism; under these circumstances the privileged strata of the population attempt to mobilize this "surplus" in their own hands. In addition, a generally favorable review of Prebisch's last major work, which appeared in a journal with a social-democratic orientation, noted that the concept of "peripheral capitalism" contained no reference to the working class, without whose active participation it is impossible to carry out any profound social transformations.⁸

Concepts similar to those put forward by Prebisch appear in various Latin American journals and provide evidence that representatives of a broad spectrum of political currents do not accept the authoritarian "model" of the state, a model which is based on the principles of "neoliberalism." While analyzing the scale and depth of the threat posed to the continent's peoples by the fascist counterrevolution, the leftist forces take into account the appearance of similar types of currents within the democratic opposition to the most extremist factions and groups of the ruling classes. While insisting that the danger of maneuvers by counterrevolutionary forces not be underestimated, the Latin American communists at the same time emphasize the need to study the limits and possibilities of various types of actions by the fascist reaction, actions which are aimed at expanding its social base.

The communists note that Latin American fascism has not succeeded in attracting to its side all the small groups of the bourgeoisie, which has more and more disagreements with it. And the people reject fascism, too.⁹ The counterrevolutionary blocs, which the fascist reaction used for support, came to power in a number of Latin American countries, and proved to be short-lived. This resulted to no small degree from the fact that the socio-economic policy of the rightist authoritarian regimes, which is based on the neoliberal postulates of the "Chicago school," was oriented toward strengthening the positions of the multi-national corporations and their partners from among the representatives of the local monopolistic bourgeoisie. This policy inevitably conflicted with the interests of the middle strata of the population, the lower and middle levels of the bourgeoisie. Having fallen under the influence of counterrevolutionary propaganda, they at first became the mass support for reactionary state coups. Now, however, having experienced all the consequences of accelerated capitalistic modernization, with its crying social inequality, they are joining the general democratic struggle in ever greater numbers.

The crisis of the oligarchical state in Central America and the struggle for democracy

In the ideological and political struggle unleashed in defense of democracy, an ever greater role is played by the attempt to understand the revolutionary and anti-imperialist processes which are taking place in the Central American and Caribbean countries. This region proved to be the weakest link in the chain of domination by imperialism and its allies from the camp of the bourgeois land-owning oligarchy.

There are many reasons to explain this. The attempts by the reform-minded circles and adherents of the ideology of desarrollista ("developmentalism"), including those from the ranks of the armed forces, to carry out superficial social reforms in some Central American countries for the purpose of "renovating" to some degree the traditional structures and to make "civilian society" more socially mobile, did not lead to a reduction in social tension in this region; on the contrary, these attempts worsened the tension. At the best the extremist circles of the bourgeois land-owning oligarchy went only for even more limited reforms than those proposed by the desarrollistas; moreover, these circles intended to carry them out by increasing exploitation

of the working people, while preserving their own predominance in the management of the state, and while attributing to its politics ever more clearly expressed authoritarian-modernization and repressive features.

The dialectics of the socio-economic and political processes in Latin America are characterized by the fact that the ambitions of the bourgeois land-owning oligarchy and its allies in the ranks of the military elite are opposed with ever increasing energy by the opposition forces of "civilian society," which, in the words of the Chilean sociologist J. Antonio Vieira-Gallo, proved to be capable of increasing resistance to the authoritarian state.¹⁰ The process of modernization, which, as a rule, is carried out by barbaric methods, could not fail to lead to definite changes in the social structure of the Central American countries. The number of people engaged in hired labor, was increased, especially the working class, and new groups of the middle strata appeared. A natural result of this was the rapid growth in the semiproletarian and marginal population, which to a larger or smaller degree was also the bearer of social protest, and which denied the "model" imposed by the oligarchy of the authoritarian-modernization repressive state. These moods exerted an influence as well on the armed forces, in whose ranks a struggle was taking place among various tendencies and currents, and which at times lead to open, anti-oligarchical actions by some of the military, as was the case in El Salvador in 1972, or to the emergence of a phenomenon such as the coming to power of "military reformism" adherents in Honduras in the mid-70's.

The victory of the Sandinista revolution demonstrated in concentrated form the scale and acuteness of the social contradictions which bubbled to the surface of social life in Central America. The uniqueness of the situation in Nicaragua, where the state was in the hands of the Somoza clan over a period of many decades, consisted in the fact that the dictatorship not only functioned as a very cruel exploiter of the working masses but also came into sharp conflict with influential circles of the local bourgeoisie in its attempts to seize key positions in the economy. At the same time the triumph of the Sandinistas showed that the Nicaraguan revolution, given all the specific features and even the uniqueness from the viewpoint of concrete historical conditions which led to its victory, posed many fundamentally important problems, which have universal significance for the development of liberation processes in the region.

The Sandinista leaders are working to see the establishment of a democratic system in their country which would ensure genuine participation by the popular masses in government, which would satisfy their essential needs and open up access to education and culture for them. The forces of domestic and internal reaction which are hostile to this kind of development are attempting to discredit the revolutionary transformations, stating that they lead to a "limitation of democracy," and eliminate "political pluralism." These forces have put forward the thesis that the people are not capable of creative activities and management of the state.

In answering these attacks, the chairman of the Revolutionary Democratic Front (RDF) of El Salvador, Guillermo Ungo, emphasized that accusations of

of this kind have nothing in common with genuine democracy, because the discussion concerns the minority's claims to power, while the Sandinistas express the will of the absolute majority of the people.¹¹ The revolutionary government is striving for develop to the maximum possible degree the level of the people's activities and their conscious participation in the resolution of problems at all levels of social and state life.

The experience of the Nicaraguan revolution is studied in Latin America as well from the viewpoint of ways to develop the revolutionary struggle, which is aimed at breaking the old state machinery. Moreover, a number of researchers proceed from the thesis of the so-called "Somoza-ization" of all the bourgeois states of the continent, without exception. Luis Marini, who is an adherent of this concept, claims that the Somoza dictatorship created an authoritarian-corporatist state on the basis of an alliance between the monopolistic bourgeoisie and the armed forces, a state which is similar to those "present-day dictatorships," which have arisen in other countries of Latin America in the course of the "bourgeois and imperialist counterrevolution." From this point the conclusion is drawn that the "Somoza-ization" of political regimes makes the path of armed struggle with the outcome in favor of socialism something inevitable.¹²

This viewpoint has aroused well-grounded and correct criticism. Undoubtedly, the Nicaraguan revolution has shown once again the enormous significance which the question of power has for revolutionaries. However, the question of power should not be considered to be the same as the problem of selecting one of the paths of struggle, armed or unarmed. Moreover, certain revolutionary detachments should not be set against others on this basis. This was noted, in particular, by Rodney Arismendi in one of his last speeches.¹³

The experience of the Nicaraguan revolution has shown once again that new revolutionary-democratic parties and movements, which in a number of cases head the revolutionary process, are coming to the center of the stage. But in and of itself this phenomenon does not mean, as some of its interpreters claim, that the discussion concerns the new forces, which are called upon to replace the communist parties, "which have taken the path of reformism." Without mentioning the fact that the communist parties of Latin America have supported the Sandinista revolution energetically and decisively, daily experience shows that the movement of new revolutionary parties and organizations onto the center stage of the political struggle opens up broader perspectives for the unity of the leftist forces. There is no doubt that disagreements and differences of opinion exist between the communists and the new leftist revolutionary-democratic organizations on a whole series of questions. However, this circumstance in no way hinders the expansion of cooperation among them, nor does it hinder the establishment of a democratic type of state, which is confirmed by the entire experience of the development of the liberation process in all the Latin American countries.

In El Salvador the communist party has been fighting for a long time alongside other revolutionary organizations, having put forward with them a joint political plan, which is oriented toward the establishment of a new

type of democratic state. The political forces which are united within the ranks of the RIF and the Farabundo Marti Front are conducting an armed struggle, but do not have as their ultimate goal the imposition of their views and ideas on those political parties and movements of a liberal-democratic or reformist type which are not part of their ranks. Further, they have proposed more than once the start of broad national dialog, while trying to solve the country's fundamental problems through peaceful means. As Guillermo Ungo has emphasized, new opportunities for such dialog are created while the extreme rightists are in power, because they arouse dissatisfaction and disappointment in those political circles, and especially among Christian democracy, which are looking in large numbers for a way out of the country's crisis.¹⁴

In contrast with Nicaragua, the Salvadoran oligarchy has been aided in its efforts to maintain its dominant positions by the fact that it has expanded its sphere of influence, without limiting itself to the traditional area for the use of its capital--the coffee plantations. According to the Salvadoran sociologist, N. Mariscall, "the coffee oligarchy, once it had ceased to be involved in just coffee, quickly modernized as a result of favorable opportunities presented to it by the Common Market of Central America and the desarrollist policy, and turned into a large, agrarian-industrial bourgeoisie."¹⁵

This process of the Salvadoran oligarchy's transformation was accompanied by the strengthening of its reactionary nature, and by its increasingly sharp opposition to the implementation of any social transformations, especially in the area of agrarian relations. Drawing its main support from that part of the military elite which has reactionary inclinations, the oligarchy offered stiffened resistance to the attempts by the military reformists to carry out a number of transformations after the Romero dictatorship was overthrown in October 1979, and it expelled them from the army. To a significant measure it was the extremist diehards from the oligarchy camp who were responsible for the unleashing of the ultra-rightist terror to which the democratic and patriotic forces responded with armed struggle.

Nor is the Guatemalan oligarchy any less "deaf" to the spirit of the times. This can be explained to no small degree by the fact that for many years the country was in a state of permanent socio-political crisis, caused by the outbursts of the counterrevolution following the 1954 overthrow of the anti-imperialist government of Jacobo Arbens. In essence, the Guatemalan oligarchy concentrated all of its attention on the "institutionalization" of completely naked violence as a form of rule. This is the source of the atrophy which has occurred in the role played by the armed forces in society; the military elite has entered into a close alliance with the most extremist factions of the ruling classes. Moreover, the army has created its own "political infrastructure," controlling a number of the parties which it has created, and manipulating the mechanisms by which candidates are nominated for the presidency, as well as other key posts in the government and state administration.

In Guatemala one can see with particular clarity the process described by the Costa Rican sociologists Edelberto Torres-Rivaz and Vinicio Gonzalez:

"The symbiosis of the interests, which are predetermined by the ideological kinship of the representatives of the higher military hierarchy and the most extremist groups of the privileged classes, becomes more and more obvious each time. For this reason the impression is frequently created that the army or the state itself acts as a kind of special political party."¹⁶

In our day Guatemala serves as one more convincing confirmation of the possibilities which the leftist forces have to achieve unity in the struggle against dictatorial regimes, while opening up new prospects for the anti-oligarchical movement, which is aimed at creating a democratic state. The ever broader participation of the oppressed Indian masses in the liberation struggle is a fact of particular significance. Even very recently they were politically passive and frequently they became the object of manipulation by the reaction. Attempts by various radical leftist groups to arouse the Indians to take up the struggle by appealing to a "racial revolutionary mysticism" did not lead to any positive results. On the contrary, the attempts helped to isolate them ever further from the democratic forces. In recent years the revolutionary democratic parties and movements which have arisen in the country, the Guerrilla Army of the Poor for example, have accomplished a great deal in formulating the Indian question in a different manner, linking its solution to the active participation by the Indians along with other racial and ethnic groups of the population in the struggle for democracy and freedom. As the leftist forces of Guatemala emphasize, it is only through the victory of the popular revolution and the people's active participation in the government of the new democratic states that the Indian masses will find the solutions to their problems and will also make their own contribution to the social and cultural development of the country.¹⁷

When talking about the successes of the liberation struggle in the countries of Central America, some of the Caribbean states, especially Grenada, must not be passed over. This is because Grenada shows in a concentrated form many of the important changes in the countries of this zone, specifically, changes related to the revolutionary-democratic forces' development of a state structure which would be an alternative to the neocolonialist "Westminster model" of a political system. The ruling circles of England have tried to impose on their former colonies this "model," which is based on the existence of two political parties, which alternate in power.

Over an extended period of time opposition to the policy of disseminating the "Westminster model" was expressed frequently in the form of spontaneous popular actions, which took place under the slogans of racial superiority. Attempts to give these actions something of an organized and politicized nature were made by leaders of the "black power" movement, which itself was strongly influenced by the ideology of "black racism," and which appealed to various black cults of African origin and to tribal vestiges. Naturally, there could not be any discussion of a constructive alternative to neocolonialism under these circumstances.

Under the influence of the intensifying liberation processes in Latin America, a number of the Caribbean countries saw the gradual emergence of new

revolutionary-democratic parties and movements which have overcome the racial-ethnic orientation in their theoretical constructions and set out along an anti-imperialist path, while experiencing an ever greater influence from Marxist ideas. According to the Argentinian sociologist Anaes Serbin who has studied the evolution of those parties and movements, in Grenada tendencies of this kind have been most fully embodied in the activities of the revolutionary democratic party called the New Jewel Movement, especially since it came to power in February 1979. The rejected "Westminster model" was opposed here by new forms of democratic development, which were based on the active participation by the popular masses, who have been brought together in various types of associations, in the governing of the country.¹⁸

The revolutionary and liberation processes, which are unfolding in Central America and the Caribbean, are becoming an important factor in the liberation movement of the Latin American peoples; they provide evidence that the debates about the alternatives for the development of society are acquiring every greater depth and scope.

The struggle of the progressive forces for renewed democracy and the problems of the state

Under conditions of the acute ideological struggle with regard to developmental paths for the Latin American countries and their historical destinies, the elaboration by the Latin American communists and their allies of strategy and tactics which offer an alternative to the plans of the extremist groups and factions of the predominant classes is acquiring ever greater significance, both practical as well as theoretical. The reason why it is important for the communists to propose alternative plans and programs is that they enrich and deepen people's understanding of the essence of those socio-economic and political shifts which have taken place in recent decades; they also contribute to the overcoming of incorrect and one-sided conclusions, and they open up the path to more fruitful and constructive dialog with representatives of various progressive and democratic parties, movements and groups. The focus of the communists' attention is on those problems which are related to an analysis of the dynamics of the state's role in Latin America, and of its complex, inter-relations with "civilian society."

The Chilean communists are making a large contribution to the treatment of these problems. On the basis of an in-depth and multi-faceted analysis of the changes which have taken place in the country since the 1973 counter-revolutionary coup, they have come to the conclusion that the dominance of the most aggressive circles of the financial oligarchy, which enters into close alliance with the multi-national corporations, has been established in Chile. And it is the representatives of the financial-oligarchical clans who have seized the key positions in the state apparatus, having put the state at the service of their own interests. "Never before in the country's history," emphasized Orlando Millas, "have there been such close relations between the monopolies and the state."¹⁹

The widely publicized plans of the ideologues and leaders of the fascist counterrevolution with regard to the institutionalization of their dominance by means of the pseudo-democratic constitution imposed upon the country in 1980 proved in fact to be nothing other than an attempt to use it as a screen to protect the dominance of the most aggressive groups and factions of the ruling classes. Despite all the attempts by the forces of the reaction, which leans for support on the might of the authoritarian-repressive state, to atomize civilian society and introduce into it a spirit of the most unrestrained individualism and competition by using the principles of "economic liberalism," the forces of resistance to this policy are growing. The communists are working out their own strategy and tactics for the struggle against the dictatorship using as their basis an analysis of the essence and nature of the social contradictions in the depths of Chilean society, contradictions which have been provoked by the imposition of the "Chicago model" in this country. The communists proceed from the premise that this struggle, which has an anti-imperialist and antimonopolistic direction, is capable of bringing together the broadest strata of the population, including the non-monopolistic portion of the bourgeoisie.

The strategy for the struggle against the dictatorship includes as an important component the question regarding the essence of that type of democracy which will be established after the defeat of the fascist counterrevolution. In many respects this democracy, according to Luis Corvalan, will be fundamentally different from the bourgeois-liberal interpretation of that word, an interpretation which "is satisfied when rights are proclaimed for an abstract person and political equality is declared for citizens within the framework of this system, which is characterized by profound social inequality and makes the people's liberties ineffective in practice or substantially limits them." Only by eliminating the socio-economic base of the reaction, the communists emphasize, can a renewed democracy for the people be created, a democracy in which the people will participate actively in governing the country. But this requires, in their opinion, the expropriation of the property of the largest and most influential financial-oligarchical clans, as well as the nationalization of the property of a number of the multi-national corporations. The communists do not hide the fact that their approach to the creation of a firm basis for the renewal of democracy differs from the viewpoint of a number of the opposition forces, including that of Christian democracy, particularly with regard to the ways and means of the struggle against the domination of monopolistic capital in all spheres of the country's life. However, while they are convinced adherents of the policy of broad alliances, the communists approach it least of all as some kind of situational phenomenon or as a means of imposing their views and concepts on others.²⁰

The Brazilian communists are carrying out the struggle under different conditions. The policy of modernizing capitalism has led, as they emphasize, to the establishment of the state monopoly capital system, to the emergence of a financial oligarchy, which has taken dominant positions among the bourgeoisie, and it has led to the worsening of social contradictions. Disagreements within the ranks of the bourgeoisie, its conflicts with the multi-national corporations, as well as the opposition of various of its factions

and groups to the policy of the authoritarian state on a whole series of foreign and domestic policy issues, have opened up opportunities to expand and intensify the struggle for democracy in the country. The Brazilian communists see that the main condition and guarantee of the success of the struggle, which is anti-imperialist and anti-monopolistic in nature, lies in the unity of the democratic forces, which rely for support on the broad network of their own associations and organizations. "Only this kind of democracy of the masses, who are organized from the bottom to the top, can ensure the creation of a broad democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-monopolistic bloc of forces and its active participation in national politics."²¹

Despite all the attempts by the authoritarian state and its ideologues in Uruguay to hinder the expansion of the struggle for democracy, and to limit the forced process of liberalization by the framework of the "limited democratic" regime, which takes an extremely anti-popular and anti-communist form, the democratic forces have succeeded in gaining new beachheads in the struggle for renewed democracy, as well as to move along the path of unity. The communists are participating actively and constructively in this struggle; they are working for broad democratic unity, and for the use of all opportunities to expand and intensify step by step the struggle against the reaction's plans to become firmly established in power. In a recent statement the Uruguayan communists state: "The communist party, in its awareness of its own responsibility, is again calling on all patriots and democrats, who are in or outside the country, to unity and solidarity in the struggle for democracy, which is the universal task, and not a prerogative of only a few."²²

In the intensification of the struggle for democracy important processes are also taking place in Argentina. The crisis in the South Atlantic demonstrated with great clarity the deep patriotism of the working masses and their willingness to act decisively against imperialism, and to make their own contribution to the strengthening of the country's defense capability. However, at the time of the conflict there was a sharp upswing in the struggle of the broadest strata of the population, political parties, trade unions and other mass organizations, a struggle which was carried on for the democratization of the country and which indicated rejection of the socio-economic policy based on the postulates of the "Chicago school." The very fact of the upswing in the struggle for democracy, in which the working class is participating actively, provides convincing evidence that the forces of extreme reaction did not succeed in breaking the people's resistance or in subordinating it to the imperatives of the repressive-authoritarian state's policies. A large contribution to the struggle for democracy is being made by the communist party; its multi-faceted and fruitful activities are exerting a profound influence on the political, spiritual and cultural climate in the country. In working out their strategy and tactics for the struggle to create renewed democracy, the communists proceed from the existence of powerful forces in Argentinian society, which are capable of inflicting defeat upon the reaction and of opening up the way to profound anti-oligarchical and anti-imperialist transformations.²³

The reasons why it is important for the communists to develop an anti-imperialist and antimonopolistic strategy and tactics in the struggle are even more significant because the discussion concerns not only the countries with repressive authoritarian regimes, but also those states where "representative democracy" exists. It is there that the process of capital concentration and centralization is taking place and the local monopolistic groups of the bourgeoisie are strengthening their positions, while trying to subordinate the state to their interests; in the process they are manifesting ever more obvious antidemocratic sentiments. In these countries the theory and practice of "limited democracy" are exerting an ever increasing influence.

These problems occupy a significant place in the theoretical elaborations and investigations of the communist parties, as well as in their platform documents. The political declaration of the 6th Congress of the Venezuelan Communist Party emphasized that as the local monopolistic bourgeoisie, which enters into an alliance with imperialism, becomes more firmly established in power, the country experiences the gradual imposition of a regime of "limited democracy"; this is explained by the growing economic might of the monopolies and the growing tendency toward the creation of the state monopoly capital system, which is nothing other than dictatorship of the exploiting classes. The Venezuelan communists came to the conclusion that a state policy which is conducted in the interests of the privileged groups of the population creates the conditions for the unification of broad strata of the population in the struggle against the alliance of the local monopolies and the multi-national corporations. In their platform the Venezuelan communists advance and provide support for the thesis concerning an anti-imperialist and antimonopolistic strategy of the revolutionary struggle with an orientation toward socialism, a struggle which lays the foundations for a new type of democracy, which is capable of "making participation by the people in the taking of political and economic decisions" a reality.²⁴

The Colombian communists are working on problems which are similar in many respects. In their analysis of the reasons for the strengthening of reactionary tendencies in the politics of the dominant classes, they see them mainly in the process of the rapid concentration and monopolization of capital, and in the emergence of aggressively and anti-democratically inclined new groups of the local monopolistic bourgeoisie. The strategy and tactics of the Colombian communists are put together with consideration for the consolidation of the upper monopolistic bourgeoisie and its growing desire to use the state to impose a regime of "limited democracy" in the country.

Of course, fatalism in the evaluation of the prospects for the struggle to prevent the forces of the extreme reaction from coming to power is alien to the communists. They warn that the thesis which states that the fascist counterrevolution actually rules the country already is mistaken. "This position can lead to a situation in which people identify "limited democracy," which represents the reactionary process of the growing limitation

of democratic liberties, with the establishment of an open, fascist-terrorist dictatorship."²⁵ At the same time the Colombian communists note that the growth in the movement of the democratic forces against the half-formed reactionary intentions of the local monopolistic bourgeoisie and its foreign allies as well as the addition of new forms for that movement open up favorable prospects for the anti-oligarchical struggle. In its platform the communist party puts forward and provides support for the idea of creating a broad patriotic front, which is capable of gaining victory over an alliance of the local and foreign monopolies and of opening up the path to the creation of a renewed democracy.²⁶

Over a long period of time the Mexican communists have worked out a strategy for the antimonomopolistic struggle, which is inextricably linked to the prospects for the creation of a new type of democracy. They have noted that the process of capital centralization and concentration, which is accompanied by growth in the reactionary and authoritarian sentiments within the ranks of the monopolistic bourgeoisie, is opposed by the growing democratic aspirations of the laboring masses.²⁷ These same ideas have also found reflection in the platform documents of the United Socialist Party of Mexico, which arose from an amalgamation of the communist party and other leftist revolutionary-democratic organizations.

It is no accident that a central place in the alternative programs and plans of the communists and other leftist forces is taken by the problem of dialogue with the parties and movements of social democracy and Christian democracy, with the masses of believers, with democratically inclined segments of the higher clergy and with representatives of patriotic currents in the ranks of the armed forces.

The development--within the framework of the alternative programs--of the strategy and tactics for the struggle for renewed democracy with an orientation towards socialism provides evidence that the question of the political, social and cultural hegemony of the proletariat and its allies and of their right to lead the government is being moved to the center of the ideological struggle in terms of the most fundamental questions of Latin American life today.

FOOTNOTES

1. NUEVA POLITICA, Mexico, No 1, 1976, pp 175-180; ECONOMIA, Quito, No 67, 1976, p 62; T. Dos Santos, "Imperialismo y dependencia," Mexico, 1978, pp 395-405.
2. ALAI, Montreal, No 5, p 53.
3. ARACURIA DE CHILE, Madrid, No 13, 1981, p 72.
4. ESTUDIOS. S.I., No 83, 1982, pp 93-94.
5. CADERNOS do CEAS. Salvador (Bahia), No 68, 1980, pp 9-10.

6. Partido Comunista de Chile, BOLETIN DEL EXTERIOR, S.I., No 37, 1979, p 28.
7. R. Prebisch, "Capitalismo periferico, Crisis y transformacion," Mexico, 1981, pp 15, 324-325.
8. NUEVA SOCIEDAD, San Jose, No 55, 1981, p 227.
9. Luis Corvalan, "Nas zhdut novyye bitvy. Izbrannyye stat'i i rech'i" New Battles Await Us. Selected Articles and Speeches, Moscow, 1978, p 479; ESTUDIOS, No 83, 1982, p 94.
10. CHILE-AMERICA, Roma, Nos 64-65, 1980, p 154.
11. NUEVA SOCIEDAD, No 61, 1982, p 119.
12. ALAI, No 6, 1980, pp 64-65.
13. ESTUDIOS, No 83, 1982, pp 20-21.
14. NUEVA SOCIEDAD, No 61, 1982, pp 116-117.
15. ESTUDIO CENTROAMERICANOS, San Salvador, No 365, 1979, p 145.
16. ESTUDIOS SOCIALES CENTROAMERICANOS, San Jose, No 3, 1972, p 55.
17. KO'EYU latinoamericano, Caracas, No 22, 1982, pp 32-33.
18. NUEVA SOCIEDAD, No 61, 1982, p 119.
19. Partido Comunista de Chile. BOLETIN DEL EXTERIOR, No 40, 1980, p 42.
20. Partido Comunista de Chile, BOLETIN DEL EXTERIOR, No 37, 1979, p 32.
21. VOZ DE UNIDADE, Sao Paulo, 8 May 1981. Suplemento especial, pp 7-12, 17, 18.
22. ESTUDIOS, No 82, 1982, p 12.
23. TODO PARA DERROTAR AL IMPERIALISMO ANGLO-YANGUI, Buenos Aires, 25 May 1982, pp 1-4.
24. "VI Congreso del PCV. Informe del Comité Central y Declaración Política," Caracas, 1980, pp 74, 79-80; Partido Comunista de Venezuela. Programa. Caracas, 1980, p 36, 70-75.
25. VOZ PROLETARIA, Bogota, 13 November 1980.
26. "Programa del Partido Comunista Colombiano," Bogota, 1981, pp 28, 49-50.
27. MACHETE, Mexico, No 7, 1980, p 27.

Copyright; Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1983

SOVIET-CUBAN BOOK ON CUBAN ARMY REVIEWED

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 4, Apr 83 pp 130-134

[Review by Ye.A. Larin of book "Muzhestvo i bratstvo. Valentia Y Fraternidad" /Courage and Fraternity. Valentia Y Fraternidad/, edited by I.N. Shkadov, P.A. Zhilin, T. Varnot Pubillones and V.V. Vol'skiy, Voenizdat, Moscow, 1982, 239 pages]

[Text] The title of this new joint work by Soviet and Cuban scholars "Courage and Fraternity" accurately reflects its content. In this investigation the staff members of the Military History Institute of the USSR Ministry of Defense, the Latin American Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Center for Military History of the Cuban Republic's Revolutionary Armed Forces have devoted the bulk of the attention to the question of the formation of a new type of army in Cuba, the history of the fraternal cooperation between the USSR and Cuba in the area of military construction, as well as to the sources and process of the development of Soviet-Cuban friendship.

The book opens with an appeal "To the Soviet and Cuban Reader," written by Raul Castro Ruz, second secretary of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee, and Minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Cuba. "Courage and fraternity as concepts, which are applied in the area of military theory and practice," R. Castro emphasizes, "have arisen under extremely varied conditions and epochs. The origin of the first concept goes back into the depth of the ages. But it acquired genuinely revolutionary significance when the popular masses and the fighters for independence, in opposing the violence of the caste armies created by the ruling classes, demonstrated mass heroism, which was unthinkable in armies, which were created as a tool of the oppressors and possible only in just wars....

The concept of "fraternity in arms" arose not so long ago, it arose at the time when the Great October Socialist Revolution triumphed in Russia..."(p 3). The Revolutionary Armed Forces of the Cuban Republic (RVS) became the first army in the Western hemisphere which was the true defender of the interests of its own people.

The history of the RVS is the history of the Cuban revolutionaries' historical struggle against imperialism, it is the history of the construction of

the American continent's first socialist society. For this reason the author's collective should be given recognition for their indisputable success in the examination of the basic stages of RVS creation against a broad historical background and with consideration for the organic link with the key problems of the Cuban revolution and those tasks of a socio-economic and societal-political nature which it has solved and is continuing to solve.

The Leninist thesis that "no great revolution has been or can be successful without 'disorganization' in the army"¹ found convincing confirmation in the course of the revolution in Cuba. The process of "disorganization" within the Batista army is considered in the first chapter of this book. As is well known, the forms of revolutionary force used by the Cuban revolutionaries became the subject of acute debate and academic controversy. The absolutization of the armed path, which is typical of bourgeois historiography, led to the appearance of a whole series of "theories" which deny or discount the historic role of the political vanguard. This chapter traces the dialectical link between the military and political factors from the storming of the Moncada barracks on 26 July 1953 to the overthrow of the tyranny on 1 January 1959; it shows that the use of guerrilla warfare as the basic form of struggle was determined by the genuinely popular nature of the Cuban revolution, and it reveals the uniqueness of the political vanguard's formation, which arose out of the revolutionary unity of the "26th of July Movement," the Popular-Socialist Party and the Revolutionary Directorate. A large section of the chapter is devoted to the Rebel Army.

In the following chapter the subject of study is the popular-democratic, anti-imperialist and agrarian stage of the revolution, which began in January 1959, the movement of the revolution along an ascending path, and its escalation into a socialist revolution. The authors provide an in-depth analysis of the nature of the socialist transformations and note that the construction of the foundations for a socialist economy in Cuba began under the following specific conditions: on the one hand there was a deformed economic structure and general weakness of the national economy, objective difficulties related to the break with old production relations, a serious lack of skilled personnel and a lack of experience in managing the economy, and on the other hand there was economic and political pressure, as well as provocation by the imperialist forces of the USA and the world reaction and counterrevolution, there was the constant danger of armed aggression, which drew off a significant amount of the labor and material resources (pp 64-65).

The rapid development and consolidation of the world socialist economic system which was taking place during this period contributed to the establishment of the foundations for socialism. The new international conditions of production and exchange which developed within the framework of this system and which were based on the principles of proletarian internationalism and mutual assistance changed in a fundamental manner the entire system of

1. V.I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 37, p 295.

Cuba's foreign economic relations (p 67). The comprehensive economic and military aid of the socialist countries, and especially of the USSR, as well as the solidarity of all progressive humanity made it possible for the Cuban people to overcome the consequences of the economic blockade established by the USA and to withstand the crude political pressure and military provocations.

The following questions are considered in the third chapter: the Cuban armed forces' rout of the imperialist mercenaries at Playa Giron, the preparation by American imperialism for direct military aggression against Cuba, the Caribbean crisis and its lessons.

The authors call the attempt by bourgeois falsifiers to present the Caribbean crisis as a virtual U.S. victory futile. They claim that, on the contrary, this was a victory for the forces of reason; for the first time in its history American imperialism had received a worthy rebuff in the Western hemisphere and was forced to make a sensible compromise with the forces of democracy and socialism (p 147).

The RVS played an important role in warding off the encroachments by the forces of reaction and imperialism on the revolutionary gains of the Cuban people. The main stages in the development of the RVS and issues of Soviet-Cuban cooperation in the area of military construction are analyzed in the fourth chapter. The establishment and consolidation of the RVS has been carried out on the basis of the general patterns of socialist military construction with consideration for the national and historical features of Cuba; moreover, the Cuban Communist Party relies on the revolutionary and military traditions of its own people.

The work of Soviet military specialists in Cuba has great significance for the improvement of the RVS's military preparedness. R. Castro writes: "The book 'Courage and Fraternity,' which is an in-depth study of the relations and diverse forms of cooperation between our countries, acknowledges the efforts of the Soviet military specialists, who have worked and continue to work in our country. Many of them have been heroes of the Great Patriotic War. They are faithful sons of Lenin's Homeland, and in accordance with the principles of socialist internationalism, they have been and remain our teachers, while setting an excellent example of the combination of profound knowledge, discipline, industry, and a feeling of military and civilian duty" (p 4).

The concluding chapter of this interesting work treats in a comprehensive manner the diverse links between the USSR and Cuba in the period from 1959 to the early 80's.

The fraternal nature of Soviet-Cuban relations over a period of nearly three decades confirms the study's main conclusion that Soviet-Cuban friendship and military cooperation is an irreversible historical phenomenon, which has international significance; it is a valuable achievement of the Soviet and Cuban peoples and of the entire socialist community.

This new collective work by Soviet and Cuban scholars, which is strictly documentary, richly-illustrated and distinguished by a lively writing style, undoubtedly will be met with interest by the widest circle of readers.

Copyright: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1983

INSTITUTE BOOK ON REGIONAL STATES' FOREIGN POLICY REVIEWED

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 4, Apr 83 pp 132-134

[Review by A.I. Kedrov of book "Vneshnyaya politika stran Latinskoy Ameriki" /The Foreign Policy of the Latin American Countries/, edited by A.N. Glinkin, and A.I. Sizonenko, Izdatel'stvo Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya, Moscow, 1982, 304 pages]

[Text] The study under review is one of the books in the series "Vneshnyaya politika razvivayushchikhya stran" /Foreign Policy of the Developing Countries/. The work was prepared by the Latin American Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences together with scientific-research institutes in the GDR, CSSR and the PNR (Polish People's Republic), and it is the first collective work by scholars in the socialist countries on issues of the Latin American states' foreign policy.

The authors have set themselves the task of analyzing the most urgent and important questions in the foreign policy and international relations of the Latin American states, beginning with the victory of the Cuban revolution and extending to our day. The book is the first to treat with sufficient completeness such questions as the problem of a regional system of collective security, the activities of the Latin American countries at the UN, and the policy of the states in this region with regard to the developing countries of Asia and Africa.

The following are analyzed: the historical features of the Latin American countries' foreign policy, the influence exerted on that policy by revolutionary processes in the world and the liberation struggle of the peoples on the continent, and the objective socio-economic processes at a country level. Most of the attention is devoted to the changes which were experienced by this policy in the 70's under the influence of the victory of the Cuban revolution and the successes of the forces of socialism and the process of detente. It is convincingly shown that the development of multi-faceted, mutually-beneficial links and cooperation among the states of Latin American, the Soviet Union and the other CEMA member countries gave invaluable assistance to the Latin American countries in their efforts to apply new principles in their foreign policy and in their relations with other states in the Western hemisphere.

The thorough analysis which has been provided for the most important questions in the foreign policy and international relations of the Latin American countries has made it possible to draw some conclusions and make some generalizations. In the book it is noted that the positive shifts in the foreign policy of a large group of states and the increasing number of actions which they take in the world arena independent of imperialism are in the nature of a stable tendency, although it is still marked by periods of upswing and decline and by temporary lapses, etc.

In talking about the concrete manifestation of the Latin American countries' growing role in international relations, the authors of the book point, firstly to the rapid diversification of their foreign political links, as a result of which Latin America's isolation in international life has retreated into the past. Secondly, they note the extremely decisive actions by a growing number of Latin American states in defense of their national interests in the economic and political areas, actions which in recent decades have frequently led to confrontation with the imperialist powers, and primarily the USA. And the third concrete manifestation of the Latin American countries' growing international role, as noted in the book, lies in their initiating actions taken in the world arena which are exerting an influence on the course of the resolution of a number of global questions. Examples of this can be seen in the effective participation by the states of this region in the struggle to create a new international economic order, to declare this region a "nuclear-free zone," in their growing action on other disarmament questions, as well as on questions of eliminating the last vestiges of colonialism, condemning racism and apartheid.

The authors emphasize that the example of Cuba, and subsequently Nicaragua, again confirmed that immutable truth that only a victory of a true people's revolution paves the way for a truly independent foreign policy, for consistent anti-imperialism, and for the growth of prestige and authority in the world arena. As for the other Latin American states their foreign policy is characterized by a certain inconsistency, a complex and often contradictory combination of various elements: general democratic principles, an anti-imperialist component, nationalistic aspirations and tendencies to appeasement and cooperation with the imperialists, etc. Using this as their basis, the authors formulate the thesis that the relations between the foreign and domestic policies of these nations are extremely complex.

They emphasize that the formation and implementation of the Latin American countries' foreign policy course is influenced as well by those fundamental changes in the alignment of forces in the world arena which are characterized by the growing role of the USSR and the entire socialist community, and by a number of other global and regional factors.

In viewing the global factors, the authors note that during the years since the victory of the Cuban revolution, a subsystem of relations between the socialist states, on the one hand, and Latin America on the other hand, has developed, and it is stable and constantly expanding. Within the framework of this subsystem a new type of relations, which are characterized by genuinely equal rights and the sovereign equality of partners has been

confirmed. And although the volume of commercial-economic and other links within the framework of this subsystem is still relatively small, its political significance for the Latin American countries is enormous because world socialism supports their desire to achieve economic independence and to play an active role in world politics.

During this same period another new subsystem of relations between Latin America on the one hand, and the liberated countries of Asia and Africa, on the other hand, has also emerged. Thanks to this subsystem, the Latin American states have obtained foreign policy partner-allies outside the world of socialism. Also of significance is the change in the content of the traditional ties between Latin American countries and the West: the Latin American countries have significantly increased their struggle to claim more equal rights in their relations with the imperialist countries, and they have also tried to use those opportunities which have opened up as a result of the relative weakening of U.S. positions in the present-day world and the worsening of contradictions within imperialism.

As for regional factors, the authors single out two of them: the influence of socialist Cuba's active policy on the situation in the region and the growth of the international weight of the Latin American states as a result of the broad system of organs and organization for inter-state cooperation which they established in the 60's and 70's, a system which is not controlled by U.S. imperialism.

At the same time the authors take note of the difficulties which stand in the way of positive changes in the foreign policy of the Latin American countries and which are related primarily to the fact that these countries, with the exception of Cuba, continue to find themselves in a position of strong economic dependence on imperialism, especially American imperialism.

The authors use this as the basis for drawing the conclusion that the growth in the role of the Latin American countries' role in international relations is not a straightforward process. The effect of the law of unequal development under capitalism and the differentiation of the political positions of the Latin American countries increases the differences in their foreign policy orientation and approach to the solution of international problems. However, the book emphasizes that despite the existence of this differentiation, the general basis for Latin American opposition to imperialism will be preserved because the policy of the imperialist countries, especially U.S. policy, conflicts in a fundamental manner with the national interests of the Latin American countries and threatens their independence and sovereignty.

The book is not free of certain inadequacies. For example, the chapter which concerns cooperation between the Latin American states and the CEMA member nations proved wordy, and the abundant statistical data nearly squeezed out the analysis. In the section entitled "The Countries of Latin America and Japan," essentially only the question of Japan's commercial-economic expansion is considered. There is no justification for the large amount of space in section three of chapter seven on Venezuelan foreign policy which is given to the consideration of the foreign policy of

Venezuelan governments in the first 15 postwar years, while the policy of the current Venezuelan government, which came to power in early 1979, is not analyzed at all.

However, these inadequacies do not lower the generally positive evaluation of the book under review, a book which undoubtedly will be of interest not only for international studies specialists, but also for the general reader.

Copyright; Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1983

8543

CSO: 1807/291

INSTITUTE CONFERENCE ON STRUGGLE AGAINST REFORMISM HELD

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 4, Apr 83 pp 138-141

[Report by Z.V. Ivanovskiy on conference held at USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of Latin America: "Reformism in the Workers Movement"]

[Text] An international scientific conference on the subject "The Struggle against the Politics and Ideology of Reformism in the Workers Movement" was held on 12-13 October 1982 in Moscow at the Institute of Latin America of the USSR Academy of Sciences in accordance with the work plan of the subcommittee entitled "The Economy and Politics of the Latin American and Caribbean Countries" of the problem committee on multilateral cooperation among the academies of sciences in the socialist countries.

About 200 Latin American specialists from scientific-research institutes and higher educational institutions in Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union took part in the work of the conference.

Within the framework of the conference there were sessions devoted to methodological and general problems in the study of reformism in Latin America, to the struggle of the communists and other leftist forces against the ideology and politics of reformism and to the features of reformism in individual Latin American countries. Nineteen papers (including eight by foreign participants in the conference) and 11 presentations of other kinds were heard.

The conference was opened by the director of the Institute of Latin America, Professor and Doctor of Economic Sciences V.V. Vol'skiy. In his opening remarks he noted the extreme importance and complexity of the problem under consideration. V.V. Vol'skiy pointed to the heterogeneity of reformism, and to the need to discover its various currents, the tendencies in its development, its points of contact and spheres of cooperation among revolutionary and reformist forces, which can include the struggle for peace, for the preservation of detente, as well as the struggle against the reaction and fascism and the struggle against imperialism. The speaker took note of the importance of further bringing together the efforts of scholars from the socialist countries in the area of research into the ideological and political problems of Latin America.

Doctor of Historical Sciences and Professor A.F. Shul'govskiy (IIA) examined the basic directions in the investigation of reformism at the present stage. Much of the attention in the report was devoted to changes in the policies of the ruling classes which are taking place under the influence of objective and subjective factors. It was noted that in a number of Latin American countries which have rightist authoritarian regimes, various influential factions and groups of the bourgeoisie oppose repressive acts and go along with the development of a policy of social maneuvering and more flexible methods for exerting ideological influence on the masses. A.F. Shul'govskiy directed attention to the need for a more differentiated approach to the policies of the multi-national corporations and to the importance of investigating reformism in its populist and desamplified versions.

In his report Doctor A. Dessau (GDR) used an analysis of the historical roots of reformist concepts in Latin America as the basis for his conclusion that the sentiments of economism and the idealization of bourgeois democracy were characteristic of certain strata of the working class as long ago as 1880-1917, the period of struggle for the implementation of the historical tasks of the bourgeois revolution. The fact that these tasks are not resolved results in the preservation of petty bourgeois ideological elements in the working class.

Doctor of Historical Sciences and Professor B.M. Merin (IIA) showed in his report "The Scientific and Technical Revolution and the Social Base of Reformism in the Workers Movement" the influence of that revolution on the structural changes of the proletariat in the Latin American countries, as well as its influence on the achievement of higher skill and general education levels, and the expansion of the social boundaries of the working class. The speaker emphasized that there are many strata remaining in the proletariat due to features of its formation, and this multi-strata nature predetermines the influence of the ideology of economism, an ideology which sometimes comes forward in an ultra-leftist form, on certain segments of the working class which do not yet have sufficient experience of class battles.

Doctor of Historical Sciences M. A. Okuneva (of IMRD [Institute of the Workers' International Movement]) analyzed the struggle of the multi-national corporations against the growth of class consciousness of the Latin American proletariat and noted that the multi-national corporations switched to introducing the ideology and practice of modern trade unionism into the milieu of workers organizations: there is evidence of this in the massive training of trade union functionaries which has been started with the help of funds from the multi-national corporations and is under their ideological control.

An analysis of the program documents coming from trade union organizations and associations is extremely important from the viewpoint of the evolution of the idea of working class and trade union "participation." In this regard, the report by Candidate of Historical Sciences E. Ye Kuznetsova (IIA) entitled "Reformist Models of Participation and the Working Class" is of great interest.

In her report Candidate of Historical Sciences V.P. Andronova (IIA) showed the ideology and practice of the Catholic Church with regard to the working

class and noted that various currents, which represent the Catholic Church, do not adequately interpret its official social doctrine.

Candidate of Historical Sciences L.V. Pegusheva (IIA) examined the social-democratic tendencies in the theory and practice of the Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers; she showed the inevitability of the development of centrifugal tendencies as a consequence of the extreme right-wing positions of the trade union association leadership and the independence of the policy implemented by many national trade union centers, which formally affiliate with this Organization; this opens up opportunities to gain a portion of working class ranks which usually go to reformism onto the side of the class, proletarian world view instead.

At the conference a significant amount of attention was devoted to an analysis of the positions of the communist parties and other leftist forces in Latin America with regard to reformism in the workers movement. Doctor Yu. Notes (GIR) examined the ideological struggle of the communist parties against reformism in the Latin American workers movement in the 20's and 30's, while Candidate of Historical Sciences V.A. Tsaregorodtsev (IIA), considered the struggle of the continent's communists against the ideology and politics of reformism at the current stage.

In their reports and presentations many of the speakers noted that participation in the struggle for democracy and social progress contributes to the gradual overcoming of the masses' reformist illusions.

A discussion of the ideology and politics of various social-democratic parties and movements occupied a noticeable place in the proceedings. In the report by Candidate of Historical Sciences E.S. Dabagyan (IIA) it was noted that the leftist socialist parties provide their own interpretation of the basic social-democratic doctrines and global international problems, and place a high value on the experience of real socialism, while showing a persistent interest in the heritage of the Marxist-Leninist classics. The positions taken by the leftist socialist parties on a number of fundamental problems of the contemporary world objectively bring them closer to the communists.

Doctor V. Dyurinova (Czechoslovakia) devoted her presentation to a criticism of the "peaceful path" concept in the interpretation of the ideologues of the Socialist International; she showed the unscientific and contradictory nature of social democracy's program and noted the extreme importance of resolving the question about the content and forms of the transition from capitalism to socialism under Latin American conditions.

Doctor I. Samuilov (Bulgaria) devoted most of his report to issues concerning the training of personnel for the reformist parties and trade unions of Latin America. In her report the Bulgarian scholar dwelt on the work of the Center of Democratic Studies of Latin America.

Doctor I. Gron (Czechoslovakia) examined the role of social reformism in the revolutionary movement of Latin America, while Doctor V. Royter (GIR) used documents and materials from the Venezuelan party called "Movement to

Socialism" to show the inter-relation between revisionism and social reformism in Venezuela; he examined the evolution of this party in the 70's and analyzed the policy of the Venezuelan communists, which was aimed at the achievement of unity among all the progressive forces of the country.

Candidate of Historical sciences L.S. Poskonina (IIA) examined the evolution of the leftist radical concepts about the role of the working class in the revolutionary processes in Latin America and showed that in the late 70's and early 80's many leftist radicals approached a Marxist-Leninist interpretation in their analysis of the basic problems of Latin American capitalism.

In their presentations the conference participants showed both the historical aspects as well as the new phenomena in the theory and practice of reformism which have arisen in the first half of the 70's to the early 80's.

In his report Candidate of Historical Sciences A.I. Stroganov (Moscow State University) examined the social reformist concept of the formation and development of the proletariat and the workers movement in Argentina; he showed the evolution of the social-reformist current, which maintains a certain influence on a portion of the working people.

The speaker emphasized that despite the seeming antagonism, the social reformists and the nationalists have much in common: they both disregard the scientific approach to the problems being examined, and they conceal the irreconcilability of the class conflicts between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, as well as their hostile attitude toward Marxism and towards the communist party. One more current of Argentinian reformism--Peronism--was examined in the presentation by Candidate of Historical Sciences Ya.G. Shemyakin (IIA), who analyzed this classic example of Latin American reformism and showed the struggle of the communists to overcome the influence of Peronism's bourgeois-reformist ideology on the masses of the working people.

At the conference much attention was devoted to an analysis of the policy of social maneuvering by the dominant classes, who have set as their goal the integration of the working class into the "neocapitalist" structure of society. Using Mexico as an example, various aspects of this phenomenon were considered in the reports by Candidate of Historical Sciences A.A. Sokolov (Moscow State University), who described the results of a study of the evolution of the ideological-political platform of the present-day Mexican trade union bureaucracy, and of Doctor A. Shula (CSSR) who analyzed certain aspects of the workers movement, as well as in the presentation by Ya.G. Kuznetsova (Moscow State University), who talked about the policy of the Monterrey bourgeoisie with regard to the workers movement.

The conference participants heard a report by Candidate of Historical Sciences E.E. Litavrina (Moscow State University) on the reformist tendencies in the present-day Colombian conservatism. In the paper he showed the sources of the present-day policy of the conservative party, which achieved victory in the 1982 elections as a result of a re-examination of its campaign platform and the skillful utilization of various methods of social mobilization.

The reformist tendencies in the Colombian workers movement were examined in the presentation by Candidate of Historical Sciences Z.V. Ivanovskiy (ILA).

In the paper by Candidate of Historical Sciences N.S. Konovalova (ILA) entitled "The Strategy of the Chilean Working Class in the Antimonopolistic and Antidictatorship Struggle and the Positions of Reformism," as in the presentation by candidates of historical sciences T.L. Vladimirskaia and S.M. Usmanov (ILA) entitled "Reformism in the Trade Union Movement of Chile," much attention was devoted to a number of problems including an analysis of the position of the Christian Democratic party which was able to keep within the country its basic party nucleus and a significant portion of its mass base despite the conditions of dictatorship; moreover, it was able to increase its opposition party activities. The radicalization of reformism's positions was pointed out, and a conclusion was drawn with regard to the transformation by the Chilean trade unions into one of the most important factors in the consolidation of all progressive democratic and antidictatorship forces at the current stage.

Candidate of Historical Sciences T.Yu Zabelina (Higher Cooperative School of the Komsomol Central Committee) devoted her presentation to the evolution of the ideology and politics of the bourgeois parties in present-day Brazil, while A.N. Savin (ILA) touched on certain problems of reformism in the workers movement in the continent's largest country.

Some participants analyzed various aspects of the theory and practice of reformism in the Latin American and Caribbean countries. For example, Candidate of Historical Sciences T.Yu. Ryutova (ILA) examined the struggle of the revolutionary and reformist currents in the workers movement of Costa Rica, while A.K. Stetsenko (ILA) considered the influence of Christian democracy in El Salvador on the working class. D. Castaneda Fuertez (Cuba) looked at features of reformism in France's overseas department in the Caribbean.

A discussion was held after the reports and presentations were given.

A.F. Shul'govskiy made the concluding remarks.

All the participants noted unanimously that the conference had been conducted at a high scientific and ideological-theoretical level and that it was a serious contribution to the study of the problems of reformism by scholars in the countries of the socialist community. It was emphasized that the results of the conference have not only purely theoretical but also practical significance as well.

Copyright; Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1983

8543

CSO: 1807/291

INSTITUTE CONFERENCE ON U.S. MILITARY POLICY IN REGION HELD

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 4, Apr 83 pp 141-144

[Report by V.N. Nikolayev on conference at Latin American Institute: "U.S. Military Policy and Latin America"]

[Text] A conference entitled "The Aggressive U.S. Military Policy and the National Liberation Movement in Latin America (in the Early 80's)" was held on 10 November 1982 at the Institute of Latin America (ILA) of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The participants included researchers from the ILA, and other academic institutions and higher educational establishments of Moscow and Kiev, as well as Mario Aginada, member of the Political Committee of the El Salvador Communist Party Central Committee and of the Joint Revolutionary Leadership, Raul Ferrer, counselor from the Cuban Embassy, and Bruno Gallardo, counselor from the Nicaraguan Embassy.

In opening the conference, Professor and Doctor of Economic Sciences V.V. Vol'skiy, director of ILA, took note of its extreme timeliness and scientific significance. The forces of imperialism cannot reconcile themselves to the positive changes in the international arena; they cannot accept the fact that the world of inequality and exploitation is receding into the past and an ever greater number of countries are starting to adopt a socialist orientation. Under these conditions imperialism, and especially the USA, is attempting to hold up the onward march of history; it is increasing the arms race in both conventional as well as nuclear weapons, it is creating new foci of military danger, including one in Latin America, and it is attempting to forcefully put down the struggle of the Latin American peoples for social progress. The purposeful policy of the Soviet Union, which is aimed at preventing thermo-nuclear war and which enjoys the broad and active support of the world's peoples, the speaker emphasized, is combined with decisive solidarity which the Soviet people feel for the peoples of Latin America and other continents who are defending the right to determine their own path of development for their countries without imperialist interference.

In a report entitled "The Interventionist Course of the Reagan Administration in Latin America" Professor and Doctor of Historical Sciences A.N. Glinkin noted that the White House policy in this region is carried out in accordance with the present-day global strategy of the most aggressive circles in the USA and the NATO bloc, a strategy which is aimed at confrontation with world

socialism and the forces of national liberation. In the speaker's opinion, the "maximum program" of these forces goes against the objective course of social development in the region; it goes beyond Washington's real possibilities, leads to a serious worsening of conflicts in inter-American relations and carries a serious threat to the vital interests of the Latin American peoples.

The report by Professor and Doctor of Historical Sciences A.F. Shul'govskiy (ILA) on "The Armed Forces and the Liberation Processes in Latin America" was devoted to the criteria for a typology of the armed forces of this region's countries, to the need to study the permanent and shifting factors in the development of the armies, and to fundamental opportunities to transform them into armies of the military-patriotic type. Under present-day conditions, the speaker emphasized, it is extremely important to have a creative Marxist-Leninist treatment of the revolutionary forces' policy with regard to the army, and a concept of national security which is patriotic and anti-imperialist, taking into account the Leninist idea about the unity of the army and the people and the influence of the Bolivar traditions on the armed forces of the Latin American states.

Candidate of Economic Sciences A.D. Bekarevich (ILA) devoted his report to problems of American-Cuban relations. In its attempts to "isolate" Cuba the Reagan administration, in the speaker's opinion, is forgetting that this is no longer Cuba of the early 60's. It is a country which is stronger economically, socially and politically, and which has a firm system of links with other states in the socialist community and increased defensive might.

Bruno Gallardo (Nicaragua) presented a report entitled "The Experience of the Nicaraguan People's Struggle against the Military Imperialist Policy of the USA," in which he described the various stages in the Nicaraguan people's struggle against American interference in the internal affairs of his country in the 19th and 20th centuries and against the Somoza dictatorship as the personification of imperialist domination and the guarantee of Washington's interests in Central America. Since the victory of the Sandinista revolution, and especially since the Republican administration came to power, U.S. imperialism, the speaker noted, has not held back in its choice of means to intervene in Nicaragua; it has planted militarism and fascist dictatorships in the region and it is resorting to various mechanisms for the economic and political destabilization of regimes which do not suit it. All this forces the Nicaraguan people to carry on a tireless struggle against interventionism, a struggle for peace and detente, and to be prepared with weapons in their hands to defend the revolutionary gains, as well as the national sovereignty and independence of their Homeland.

In his report on "The Aggressive Military Policy of the USA against Nicaragua in the Past and Present" I.R. Grigulevich, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, stated that Washington's attempts to accuse the Soviet Union of "interference" in Nicaragua are designed to whitewash its own interventionist actions in Central America. The USA was resorting to actions of this kind long before the Great October Socialist Revolution. The speaker went into detail on the events related to the first note by

U.S. Secretary of State Kellogg (1925) addressed to the Soviet Union, which contained accusations of "penetration by its agents" in Central America. The fabricated nature of the "documents," which were enclosed with the note, reveals the methods of American diplomacy, which have not undergone substantial changes in subsequent years; this line can be followed through today's "documents" and "falsifications" by the United States.

In his report Raul Ferrer (Cuba) talked about the numerous instances of U.S. involvement in provocations against socialist Cuba, which include diversionary actions, the murder of Cuban diplomats, the use of bacteriological and biological warfare elements, accusations about "interference" in Central America by the Island of Freedom, attempts to worsen the republic's relations with neighboring Latin American states, various military maneuvers near the Cuban coast and with landings on Guantanamo and threats of direct incursion, etc. The anti-Cuban campaign of the Reagan administration, the speaker emphasized, is a component of the the aggressive interventionist intentions of the White House, which is attempting to overthrow progressive governments, to put a brake on the liberation movement, to strengthen U.S. economic dominance and to subordinate Central American and the Caribbean sub-region. Under these conditions the Cuban people maintain a high level of vigilance and are prepared to defend their revolution at any cost.

Mario Aginada (El Salvador) talked about the present stage in the struggle of the Salvadoran people's struggle for their independence, for social liberation, for the implementation of democratic anti-imperialist revolution and for the construction of a just society. U.S. political and military interference is the main reason for the continuation of the conflict in El Salvador; it leads to heavy consequences and threatens peace not only on a regional but also on a global scale because the White House's interventionist course does not exclude the sending of American troops as an extreme measure to save the faltering regime in El Salvador.

In his report Doctor of Economic Sciences and Professor K.S. Tarasov (ILA) touched on the military and economic relations of the USA and the Latin American countries; he noted that the nature of these ties reflects the general features of inter-American relations, specifically the dependence of the Latin American countries. The speaker directed attention to the noticeable role which the region plays in the export of mineral raw materials and foodstuffs, and to Washington's attempt to put these Latin American resources under its own control. He also discussed the Latin American military industry, which has achieved a certain level of development and which is dependent to a significant measure on the importing of technology.

Professor and Doctor of Jurisprudence M.I. Lazarev touched in his report on the international-law aspects of the U.S. position in the Anglo-Argentine conflict over the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands, emphasizing that the United States was essentially a direct accomplice and instigator of Great Britain's military-aggressive actions and violations of the decolonization principle.

Candidate of Historical Sciences O.N. Papkov (ILA) presented a report on the subject of "The Imperialist Military Policy of the USA and Latin America: a Regional Strategy of the Early 80's": he talked about the nature and features of this strategy.

M.A. Oborotova (IMEMO) [Institute of World Economics and International Relations] touched in her presentation on a number of aspects which provide evidence of a cosmetic but not a fundamental change in Reagan administration policy in Central America, a change made as a result of situational considerations and one which concerns the preservation of the policy's aggressive features.

The presentation by Candidate of Historical Sciences V.P. Kirichenko (of the Ukrainian Agricultural Academy) touched on various manifestations of U.S. neocolonialist policy in Latin America.

Candidate of Economic Sciences V.N. Sivashenkov (Moscow State University) spoke on the subject "The USA and the Militarization of the Economies of the Latin American Countries." He described the stages in the development of the military industry in the states of this region.

The presentation by Doctor of Historical Sciences A.Ye. Kuznetsov (The Military-Political Academy imeni V.I. Lenin) was devoted to the problems of defending the revolution.

Candidate of Historical Sciences Ye.V. Levykin (IIA) touched in his report on the features of U.S. policy in the area of arms deliveries to the Latin American states.

Candidate of Historical Sciences V.N. Selivanov (IVI of the USSR Academy of Sciences) dwelt on a complex of problems related to U.S. and NATO policy with regard to Latin America and to the attempts by this bloc to draw this region into the sphere of its activities; this is one more factor causing the growth of tension in the world.

V.B. Tarasov (IIA) treated in his report questions related to the influence of the Anglo-Argentine conflict on the integration processes in Latin America, emphasizing that this conflict made the Latin American countries face up to the need to create their own regional mechanism of security.

Candidate of Historical Sciences E.S. Dabagyan (IIA) took note of the unanimous condemnation of the Reagan Latin American policy by the political forces which have a social-democratic orientation; this provides evidence of an opportunity for joint actions by communists and social-democrats on a number of issues.

In his concluding remarks V.V. Vol'skiy summed up the results of the conference noting that it had posed a number of new problems; the careful analysis of these problems helps to reveal the deep roots of the processes taking place on the continent, processes which are related to the aggressive imperialist policy of the USA.

Copyright: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1983

8543
CSO: 1807/291

CONTENTS LISTED FOR MAY 83 ISSUE OF SOVIET JOURNAL ON LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 5, May 83 pp 3-4

[Table of contents for No 5, May 83 issue of LATINSKAYA AMERIKA]

[Text] Narciso Isa Conde, general secretary of the Dominican Communist Party. The Revolutionary Process Is Irreversible [For text see Latin America Political Report] 5

V.I. Bulavin. The Problem of Alternative Sources of Energy 14

Z.I. Romanova. Economic Integration in Central America: Problems and Tendencies 29

Meetings, Interviews

"The People's Will to Victory Inspires in Us Faith and Optimism" (an interview with representatives of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front) [For text see Latin America Political Report] 40

Venezuela on the Threshold of Elections (conversation with Erik Becker Becker) 2

Pages of History

A.I. Sizonenko. The Establishment of Russian Diplomatic Relations with the South American Countries and Mexico 61

Art and Literature

T.V. Goncharova, P.V. Gribanov. Mother Africa, Sources and Myths 74

Adolfo Mejia Gonzalez (Mexico): Peace, Life and Hope. Introduction and translations by Aleksey Grishin 86

V.L. Jait. Artist of the Brazilian People 94

Translations, Abstracts

In memory of the great Panamanian patriot, General Omar Torrijos (a summary of the book by Romulo Escobar Bethancourt "Torrijos: Colonia Americana, No!" [Torrijos: An American Colony, No!]) (continuation) 107

From the Pages of the Foreign Press

L.A. Valitova. Latin America in the journal KUL'TURY (Cultures) 131

Book Shelf

A.I. Stroganov. "Politicheskaya sistema obshchestva v Latinskoy Amerike"
[The Political System of Society in Latin America], edited by A.F. Shul'govskiy,
"Nauka", Moscow, 1982 133

M.V. Kulakov. "Latinskaya Amer'ka: agrarnyye reformy i ekonomicheskoye
razvitiye" [Latin America: Agrarian Reforms and Economic Development] by
Ye. V. Kovalev, "Nauka", Moscow, 1982 135

N.T. Poyarkova. "Grenada - novoye ukrasheniye Karibov" [Grenada: the New
Ornament of the Caribbean] by Jorge Luna, Havana, 1982. 136

Scholarly Life

I.B. The Jubilee Session of the Latin American Institute's Academic Council 138

One of the Oldest Soviet Latin American Specialists (a conversation with
I.R. Grigulevich, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences) 141

Copyright: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1983

8543

CSO: 1807/295

SHUL'GOVSKIY EDITS BOOK ON POLITICAL, SOCIAL SYSTEMS

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 5, May 83 pp 133-135

[Review by A.I. Stroganov of book "Politicheskaya sistema obshchestva v Latinskoy Amerike" /The Political System of Society in Latin America/, edited by A.P. Shul'govskiy, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", Moscow, 1982, 476 pages]

[Text] The authors of a fundamentally new collective work, prepared by the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of Latin America, have devoted top-priority attention to a theoretical interpretation of the developmental processes of the political system in the states of this region, and to the elucidation of its class essence, characteristic features and mechanism of the system's functioning. In this regard the first chapter (written by A.P. Shul'govskiy) is of particular interest: it is devoted to general conceptual aspects, and a large portion of it is given over to a critical analysis of non-Marxist concepts of the socio-political development of Latin America which have been disseminated in the last two decades. The remaining 11 chapters of the work are devoted to the evolution of the political system in specific countries of the region.

This structure appears to be successful because it makes it possible to avoid superficial over-simplification and to show the existence of differences between specific alternative explanations of the socio-political development in various states. Without claiming to provide a systematic description of the political structure of all the countries, the authors have concentrated their attention on an investigation of the examples of socio-political development which are most characteristic of Latin America. We should note that the small Caribbean countries, which recently have been playing an ever more noticeable role in the life of the region, and have significant specific features of their own with regard to political development, are considered in a special chapter.

A concrete historical approach to the study of the subject matter is characteristic of the book. The formational process and development of the political system in the region's countries are traced from the first decades of independence to our days. This makes it possible to interpret with greater depth their real historical significance, as well as the features and prospects of the current stage in their political development.

An analysis of the political system's evolution is provided in close conjunction with a description of the socio-economic processes, the arrangement of class forces and the development of the class and political struggle. The work reveals the real class nature of the political systems and regimes, as well as their social and economic basis.

In determining the typology of the present-day bourgeois political regimes, the authors single out two main groups: the countries of representative democracy and the countries with rightist authoritarian regimes. Within each of these groups they also find substantial differences; they determine specific features and analyze the evolution and replacement of regimes in particular countries.

The book contains a thorough investigation of the various alternatives for the mechanism by which the political system functions, and the role of its individual components at various stages of development. The influence of the experience and practice of the developed capitalist states of Western Europe and North America on the system of the Latin American republics is explained, including the flexible system which the former have devised to integrate the masses and mass organizations into the existing political structure. This is well traced using the examples of Venezuela, Mexico, and Costa Rica. An analysis is also provided for the influence of the local and traditional socio-economic and political foundations, and the utilization of paternalistic and caudillistic methods for controlling the masses.

A great deal of attention is devoted to the operational mechanism, the ideology and the politics of the rightist authoritarian regimes, to the role of the armed forces as their most important component, and to the reasons for the instability and crisis in the early 80's which has marked the political structures of this group of countries.

In studying the developmental features of the political system in Latin American society, the authors come to the conclusion that here, in comparison with the European bourgeois countries, the state has acted "as a much more active force, stimulating from above the consolidation of the local bourgeoisie's positions" (p 61).

They direct attention to the growing influence exerted on the political system of the Latin American republics by factors related to the formation of monopolistic capital and state-monopolistic tendencies when external dependence is retained; they also direct attention to the influence of the multi-national corporations on these processes. The work emphasizes that the growth of authoritarianism is a characteristic feature of the present stage in the development of the political system in the Latin American countries; other characteristic features include the consolidation of the executive power at the expense of the legislative, the growth of the state's economic functions, and the growing role of the state bureaucracy, "pressure groups" (corporate organizations of the ruling classes, the professional bureaucracy and others). At the same time the book takes note of the fact that the strengthening of reactionary and antidemocratic tendencies in the politics of the ruling classes "is opposed... by another

tendency--the growth of the democratic aspirations of the popular masses" (p 5). To this the following are added in Latin America: growing disagreements within the camp of the ruling classes and contradictions between the bourgeois landowning oligarchy, which is tied to foreign capital, and strata of the middle and petty national bourgeoisie. The work shows how the interaction of these opposing tendencies leads to different results in different situations.

The crisis of the bourgeois political system in the region is viewed as a component of the chronic crisis of the socio-economic and political structures, a crisis the development of which exacerbates the struggle of opposing alternatives for societal development. Particular emphasis is given to the influence of the Cuban revolution and the revolutionary upswing on the political development of this region's countries, and on the appearance here of progressively-oriented political regimes, a process which is accompanied by the formation of the elements for a new state order, for sovereignty of the people. A great deal of attention is devoted to this comparatively new problem in the main chapter, as well as in the chapters on Nicaragua, Panama, Chile (the 1970-1973 period) and on the Caribbean countries. The authors note that in a number of cases these processes still have not gone beyond the framework of definite tendencies to acquire a stable nature (Guyana, Panama) or have ended in failure (Peru, Jamaica). In other cases the process of revolutionary transformations--with the affirmation of the deciding role of the working people in those changes--is leading to the establishment of a new, revolutionary, popular-democratic state order (Nicaragua, Grenada). One's interest is aroused by the analysis of the attempt by the progressive forces in Chile to carry out revolutionary transformations through peaceful means, without rejecting the use of previous forms of the state order, but trying instead to give them new class content and to supplement them with new forms.

The book is based on the study of a wide range of primary and secondary sources: legislative acts; official government, parliamentary and party documents; press reports; works by political figures and special literature on various aspects of the subject.

Of course, in a work this large and so innovative, not everything comes out with equal success. In our opinion, one element that seems weaker than the others is the analysis of the progressively-oriented regimes; much remains unclear in the typology worked out for these regimes. The description of these regimes provided in the first chapter seems incomplete without the inclusion of Nicaragua and Grenada, where people's revolutions have been victorious.

The work contains some formulations which are not completely successful. It is impossible to agree with the assertion that by the late 50's the entire military-political system created by the US in Latin America (p 9) had been undermined, or that the mobilization of the working people by the Peronist leaders in support of the nationalistically inclined bourgeoisie's plans contributed to the strengthening of the proletariat's class consciousness (p 18). It would be more accurate to say that this contributed to the increase in the social activity level of the remaining--formerly passive--segment of the working people. The existence of a "workers' aristocracy"

in prerevolutionary Nicaragua (see p 84) is doubtful given the lack of a mature industrial proletariat. The discussion of the relative positions taken by the industrial bourgeoisie and the oligarchy in Brazil in the 1920's and 1930's (pp 307-309) is confused and contradictory. The 1937-1945 Vargas regime should hardly be put in the "rightist authoritarian" category (p 314) because it differed substantially from the rightist authoritarian regimes of the 60's and 70's. The description of the 1945 political events in Brazil (pp 312-313) has internal contradictions. The text also contains other minor, factual inaccuracies (p 127, 172, 177, 178, 182, 210, 212, 230, 232, 387, 389, 432, 465).

However, despite the specific inadequacies which have been noted, the book makes a serious contribution to the scientific treatment of the political development of the Latin American republics.

Copyright: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1983

8543

CSO: 1807/295

BOOK SURVEYING AGRARIAN REFORMS REVIEWED

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 5, May 83 pp 135-136

[Review by M.V. Kulakov of book "Latinskaya Amerika: Agrarnyye reformy i ekonomicheskoye razvitiye" /Latin America: Agrarian Reforms and Economic Development/ by Ye.V. Kovalev, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", Moscow, 1982, 270 pages]

[Text] Overcoming the backwardness of the developing countries by virtue of the features of their socio-historical development makes the implementation of agrarian transformations an urgent necessity. The experience of many developing countries, and especially the Latin American ones, shows that in places where agrarian reforms have been carried out, even if they are limited ones, great scope has been created for the development of production forces not only in agriculture but also in other branches of the economy.

The monograph under review is the first comprehensive analysis in Soviet Latin American studies of the agrarian transformations which have been carried out in the Latin American countries; the analysis encompasses the nature of the changes, their scope and socio-economic consequences.

A number of theoretical questions are posed and treated in depth in the book. For example, while analyzing the evolution of the agrarian order, the author reveals the reasons for the delay in the capitalist development of the region's countries. He notes the concentration of land ownership on a capitalist basis and comes to the conclusion that "the separation of the land from the direct producers, a process which was generated by the monopoly of latifundist property in the land, is here not only a result of present-day capitalist development but also its starting point" (p 25).

The classification which the author proposes for the agrarian reforms carried out in the Latin American countries is worthy of attention. His assertion that a change in the production relations in agriculture is the main criterion for evaluating agrarian reforms (p 95) is well grounded.

From a methodological viewpoint, the author has made an important distinction between the two stages in agrarian transformations: alienation of property in land and the creation of new property in land, as well as new

economic forms. In contrast with bourgeois researchers, who as a rule see in agrarian reform the process by which property in land is alienated, Ye.V. Kovalev, while acknowledging this process as the starting point for agrarian transformations, concentrates most of his attention on the second stage. And this is perfectly correct because the depth not only of agrarian transformations but also of the socio-economic orientation of a country's development as a whole depends on how the reformed sector will be developed, which organizational-economic forms it will take.

In the countries of this region agrarian reforms are carried out under conditions of acute political and ideological struggle. The book contains an interesting polemic with the authors of bourgeois ideas of agrarian reforms, R. Fernandez-y-Fernandez, W. Roberts Berrigan, J. Wilkie and others (p 128, 204, 208).

Ye. V. Kovalev's book expands the current ideas about the nature and content of agrarian transformations in the developing countries. It is of interest to specialists, and it will also be a great help to students at various levels.

Copyright: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1983

8543

CSO: 1807/295

JUBILEE INSTITUTE SESSION DISCUSSES SOVIET-LATIN AMERICA TIES

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, in Russian No 5, May 83 pp 138-140

[Article by I.B.: "The Jubilee Session of the Academic Council of the Institute of Latin America"]

[Text] On 23 December 1982 the academic council of the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of Latin America (ILA) held a session devoted to the 60th anniversary of the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The honored guests at the session were leaders from a number of communist parties and representatives of the liberation movement in the Latin American countries, including Eduardo Gallegos Mansera, member of the politburo and secretariat of the Venezuelan Communist Party Central Committee; Ruben Dario Sousa, general secretary of the Panamanian People's Party Central Committee; Rene Teodor, general secretary of the Central Committee of the United Party of Haitian Communists; Ananias Maidan, member of the political committee of the Paraguayan Communist Party Central Committee; Marcos Leonel Posadas, secretary for international questions of the United Socialist Party of Mexico; Marta Castelgrande, a member of the leadership of the Guatemalan Labor Party and Marisol Galindo and Ana Maria Guadalupe Martinez, representatives of the leadership of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front.

The session was opened by V.V. Vol'skiy, doctor of economic sciences and director of the USSR Academy of Sciences' IIA, who presented a report entitled "The 60th Anniversary of the USSR and Latin America." In welcoming the dear Latin American friends, as well as experts in Latin American studies from Leningrad, Kiev, Dnepropetrovsk, Tomsk and other cities in our country who had come for the session, V.V. Vol'skiy emphasized that the 60th anniversary of the Soviet Union was a great national holiday, which the entire progressive community of the world was marking along with the Soviet people. The emergence and successful development of the USSR, which is a new type of state, the speaker noted, is convincing practical confirmation of the deeply humane ideas of Marxism-Leninism and the triumph of the Leninist national policy.

Since the first days of its existence, the Soviet country, V.V. Vol'skiy noted, has carried out a consistent struggle for peace and against the arms race, a struggle for the development of multi-faceted, mutually beneficial relations based on equal rights to be maintained with all states, including the countries of Latin America. Our foreign policy, the speaker emphasized in conclusion, serves the cause of peace and the interests of all humanity.

Those present at the session provided a warm reception for the presentation by E. Callegos Mansera, who said that the Soviet Union, which is faithful to Leninist tenets, is a bulwark in the struggle for the peaceful coexistence of states with different socio-political systems, and the embodiment of the Leninist national policy. The IIA of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the speaker noted, is making its own contribution to the development of ties between the peoples of Latin America and the Soviet Union. There is no doubt that the basic research by the institutes' scholars, including the two-volume encyclopedic reference work "Latinskaya Amerika," and the publication of the journal LATINSKAYA AMERIKA and others contribute to better mutual understanding among our peoples and have great significance for the progressive forces of the continent in their struggle for the genuine independence of their countries.

The presentation by Professor A.N. Glinkin of the IIA, who is a doctor of historical sciences, was devoted to an analysis of the USSR's foreign policy initiatives aimed at preserving and strengthening peace, and at developing good neighborly relations with other states. Studying the relations between the USSR and Latin America from Marxist positions makes it possible to treat the history of their formation and the dynamics of their development in a more thorough, objective and comprehensive manner. The Latin American countries, the speaker emphasized, have frequently put forward positive initiatives in the world arena. In the 70's, when the threat of thermonuclear war was significantly reduced, Latin America was an initiator of a number of fundamental international documents. Latin America is the only region of the world where a nuclear-free zone has been created and is functioning. The Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist alliance, A.N. Glinkin said in conclusion, have always supported the aspiration of the Latin American countries for social progress and independence.

Those present greeted with thunderous applause the speech by the legendary Ana Maria Guadalupe Martinez, an active participant in the struggle of the El Salvador patriots and a member of the leadership of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front. It is a great honor, Ana Maria said, for us to participate with you in celebrating the 60th anniversary of the formation of the USSR. She talked about the difficult and heroic struggle of the Salvadoran people for their liberation and went on to note the enormous significance of the movement for international solidarity with the Salvadoran patriots, a movement in which the Soviet Union, Cuba, the countries of the socialist alliance and all progressive people on the planet are in the front ranks. The remarkable successes of the Soviet people, who have implemented the ideas of the great Lenin, Ana Maria emphasized, inspire the Salvadoran patriots in their struggle for national liberation. Ana Maria presented congratulations and gifts to the IIA collective from the fighters of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front.

Professor and Doctor of Economic Sciences L.L. Klochkovskiy (IIA) talked in his presentation about the problems and future prospects for economic relations between the USSR and Latin America. The process of developing these ties is not easy. Difficulties have arisen not through the fault of the USSR, but as a result of resistance from the forces of

internal reaction and U.S. imperialism, which has shown more opposition to the expansion of relations with the Soviet Union here than in any other region of the developing world. The establishment of contacts and firm business ties between the USSR and Latin America (in 1981 the trade volume between the USSR and Latin America (excluding Cuba) amounted to \$3.2 billion, having increased nearly 30-fold in 10 years) arouses dissatisfaction and anxiety in the USA, which is increasing anti-Soviet propaganda and carrying out other actions to hinder the further development of mutually beneficial ties between our countries, said L.L. Klochkovskiy. Despite the efforts of the reaction, there are favorable prospects for the strengthening of Soviet-Latin American relations as a result of the USSR's great potential and the economic growth of the continent's countries.

In his presentation Marcos Leonel Posadas talked about the life and struggle of the Mexican people, as well as the difficulties which are being experienced by the Mexican economy and which have reflected heavily on the position of the working people. The process of uniting leftist forces, which was begun in 1979, has as its purpose the formation of a revolutionary workers party, which is capable of becoming an effective instrument in the struggle for the interests of the Mexican people, for independence and socialism.

Rene Teodor noted that the formation of the USSR constituted a watershed in the history of relations between peoples, and went on to talk about the lack of rights from which the overwhelming majority of the Haitian population suffers. The Caribbean, which the USA considers to be a zone of its strategic interests, is becoming at the present time one of the regions where the liberation movement is growing. The Soviet Union, R. Teodor emphasized, has always been on the side of the just struggle of the oppressed and exploited peoples and has always defended the principle of proletarian internationalism.

Candidate of Historical Sciences Yu.A. Zubritskiy (ILA) said in his presentation that the history of the struggle for social justice knows many glorious names such as Spartacus, Pugachev, Tupak Amaru, Simon Bolivar and others. However, none of them--although they sincerely aspired to the liberation of peoples--was armed with the advanced theory for the re-construction of society. Marxism-Leninism combined revolutionary theory with the practice of class battles. The active participation of the Indians, who suffer not only from systematic exploitation but also from national oppression, is of great significance for the struggle to liberate the working people of Latin America. Some scientists and political figures are attempting to oppose the experience of the USSR in the resolution of the national questions by referring to the specific features of the Latin American situation. But in reality, Yu.A. Zubritskiy noted, these specific features are exaggerated. The attempts to downgrade the success and the experience of the USSR in the resolution of the national question is unsupported and doomed to failure.

In his concluding remarks, V.V. Vol'skiy thanked the Latin American guests and all of those present for their participation in the work of the jubilee session of the academic council of the USSR Academy of Sciences' ILA, and he expressed the hope that Soviet Latin American specialists would continue to make a worthy contribution to the cause of strengthening friendship between the peoples of the USSR and Latin America in the name of peace and progress.

Copyright: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1983

8543

CS0: 1807/295

CHANGING U.S. ATTITUDES TO EAST-WEST RELATIONS IN 1970'S EXPLAINED

Moscow NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA No 3, May-Jun 83 pp 26-44

[Article by Nikolay Ivanovich Lebedev, doctor of historical sciences, professor, rector of the Moscow State Institute of International Relations of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and specialist on the history of the international relations and foreign policy of the USSR and on the history of the socialist community countries; and by Sergey Vadimovich Kortunov, candidate of historical sciences and specialist on the history of contemporary USSR international relations and foreign policy: "The Factor of Military Force in U.S. Foreign Policy: Calculations and Miscalculations"]

[Excerpts] The arms race which is picking up ever new speed in the capitalist countries, NATO's intent to deploy more improved American medium-range nuclear missiles in West Europe, the new U.S. nuclear strategy, Washington's aggressive interventionist doctrines and the expanded military presence of the United States and other imperialist states in various regions of the world--all of this testifies that imperialism as usual leans towards active use of military force in its foreign policy.

This also confirms the interest, which is being shown by Western researchers, in the problems of military force in contemporary international relations. Numerous research institutions, which are fulfilling government orders and are supported with the funds of the financial elite of NATO countries, are concerned with these problems in the West today, first of all in the United States. The works prepared by them exert noticeable influence on the formation of the military and political strategy of these states. This applies to organizations such as the Brookings Institution, the (American Institute of Owners), the Trilateral Commission and the Rand Corporation.¹ Various Western analysts, especially those who are close to the group of persons responsible for adopting foreign policy decisions, also occupy themselves with questions on using military force in contemporary international relations.²

Among West European researchers who are studying the problems of military force one should name (A. Aron, M. Juaber, A. Bofr, J. Vettig, B. Raven, G. Speidel, E. Krippendorf, E. Kingston-Maclory).

During the past several years, a considerable number of works were published in the USSR examining the role of the factor of military force in the foreign policy of imperialism.³ These works lay the necessary methodological bases for

studying military and political problems of world politics and help in finding a correct scientific approach in analyzing the role and place of military force in contemporary international relations.

The present article makes an attempt to analyze questions connected with the new factor of military force in the foreign policy of imperialism and, first of all, of American imperialism, to uncover the reasons explaining why the doctrines of using the factor of military force in international relations are gaining such broad dissemination in the West and to show the destructiveness of U.S. imperialism's military strategic conceptions aimed against the USSR and world socialism and progressive forces of the entire world.

The lessons of Vietnam war and, above all, the increasingly broad recognition by the ruling circles of the United States and other imperialist countries of the absurdity of the nuclear blackmail policy regarding the USSR have accelerated in the early seventies a change in the approach by Western strategists to understanding its strength and role in foreign policy. American researchers of international relations and prominent political figures in the West are gradually coming to a conclusion that the military factor, even if it remains the most important and necessary component of state power, can no longer be regarded as some absolute guarantee of political advantages and it is now necessary to make a greater stress on "nonmilitary parameters of force."⁴ In formulating this idea, many bourgeois ideologists called upon the United States to discard the power conceptions of the "cold war" and to "learn to speak with the world in another language."⁵

The new correlation of forces in the world arena and the positive evolution of views of the ruling circles of imperialist powers were important factors which made it possible for the socialist countries to achieve a decisive turning point in the international situation in the early seventies. Active foreign policy activity of the USSR and other socialist community countries in implementing the peace program, which was proclaimed at the 24th CPSU Congress, led to the fact that already during the first half of the seventies the relaxation of international tension was transformed into a leading trend in world politics. A process of fundamental reorganization of international relations has begun. It is precisely at this time that for the first time in the history of mankind imperialism was forced to admit publicly that in the nuclear age there is no other basis besides peaceful coexistence for relations between states with different social systems. It is well known that this most important position was stated in the "Bases for Relations Between the USSR and the United States" in May 1972.⁶ At the same time, a series of understandings and agreements were reached which embodied legal and moral norms corresponding to the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. Of special significance in this sense were the documents of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and, first of all, the Declaration of the Concluding Act, which may be referred to as the code of peaceful coexistence of countries belonging to different sociopolitical systems. Official declaration by leading countries in the West of this basic principle, which was advocated by Soviet diplomacy since the beginning of the world's first socialist state, meant public admission by the capitalist states of the historic bankruptcy of power conceptions of the "cold war" and was a manifestation of a deep crisis of the imperialist policy of power.

However, admission by the United States and its allies in NATO of the necessity of peaceful coexistence by no means meant that they have renounced pursuing their policy "from the position of strength." Moreover, despite the significant reappraisal of imperialism's foreign policy priorities in favor of nonmilitary spheres of competition and confrontation of the two systems (economic, political and ideological), the military factor remained as usual, even if in a modernized version, a decisive one in the foreign policy strategy of principal capitalist countries during the seventies. Adjusting the policy of force to new strategic realities which developed in the world during the seventies, U.S. imperialism strived only to move the use of military force to a more safe course for itself. Essentially, this desire meant acknowledging failure of the traditional forms in using military force, which have been practiced by the imperialist countries during the years of the "cold war," but not acknowledging the crisis of military-power policy as such.

Attempts by imperialism to modernize its policy of strength were practically embodied in the strategy of "realistic deterrence," which was advanced by the United States in 1971 and adopted officially by NATO afterward. As emphasized by many political and military figures in the West, it is qualitatively different from former strategic conceptions of imperialism, particularly from the strategy of "flexible reaction." While the former strategy was basically aimed at using military power directly during various stages of "escalation," the new one placed greater stress on psychological forms in using of "retribution" potential in foreign policy, and what's more the psychological influence on an adversary was thought to be constant and comprehensive. This approach was indeed an innovation compared with the nuclear blackmail which was practiced by imperialism in the fifties. In the present instance it meant a conception of constant international tension caused by "balancing on the brink of war."

The strategic potential of "deterrence" was declared as a sort of a "background" of international relations, active foreign policy. American ruling circles believed that the situation of a permanent threat of a nuclear war is advantageous because of its relative uncertainty and creates necessary conditions for pressuring other countries by economic, political and ideological means and also by "proportioned" use of military force in critical situations. In accordance with this approach, the United States attempted to continuously use this strategic potential in foreign policy as a sort of psychological means of pressure on an adversary. They tried to use it in this manner in local wars, in the struggle in the sphere of influence, at talks and in solving various international problems. By using the policy of "deterrence," wrote American author T. Shelling, who is engaged in strategic research, "a state, which has great military power, can get everything that cannot be achieved by politics alone."⁷

The plausibility of "deterrence," according to the view of American strategists, must be supported not only by availability of means of compulsion but also by readiness to use them decisively. As an indicator of such readiness, Western politicians have declared a system of impressive military shows, which, in their opinion, must be staged periodically. For example, Kissinger stressed that a high level of the U.S. military budget and constant military shows must be "a signal of continuous resolve by the United States to use force."⁸ Moreover, it is considered in the West that one of the most effective forms of demonstrating

military power are large maneuvers, which are systematically held by the Pentagon and the commands of integrated military systems of the imperialist countries for the purpose of exerting "detering" influence on the USSR and other socialist community countries. In opening Autumn Forge-79 maneuvers, U.S. General B. Rogers, Supreme Allied Commander of NATO United Forces, stated: "It is necessary to preserve the deterring strength of the North Atlantic alliance."⁹

The same task, according to the design of American strategists, should also be fulfilled by all possible perfection of the "deterrence" potential, i.e. the arms race which is picking up ever new speed. "The United States," American author W. Kintner wrote, "cannot ensure deterrence by desiring it alone. It must constantly strive for improving arms."¹⁰ The continuous efforts by the United States and other NATO countries to create more improved arms during the seventies expressed imperialism's aspiration to ensure itself with the possibility of using military force against world socialism.

What is the present correlation of the "realistic deterrent" strategy, this new modernized variety of the policy of strength, with the course toward an "East-West" dialogue, which was proclaimed by the American Administration during the seventies? After all these concepts are mutually incompatible. Meanwhile, it is known that the course toward talks with the USSR was declared by the United States simultaneously with the adoption of the "realistic deterrence" strategy. This proves that from the very beginning the United States allowed parallel implementation of the new strategy and detente. In other words, in the bourgeois interpretation these two concepts not only did not contradict each other but were mutually complementary.

The fact is that U.S. imperialism would have liked to interpret the detente itself, as indicated by events during the second half of the seventies, as a sort of Soviet-American understanding on preserving the international and socio-political status quo in the world. "Deterrence" should have, according to the designs of the American leadership, guaranteed implementation of this American interpretation of relaxation of international tension. The new strategy should have been a means with whose aid the United States would have imposed such an interpretation on the USSR. The U.S. approach to detente thus intended an attempt to somewhat combine the process of relaxation of tension with the modernized variety of its power policy, a sort of "detente from the position of strength." Essentially the question was about a renewed variety of old imperialist plans for dividing the world into spheres of influence.

Bourgeois authors declared that the most important prerequisite of detente is the military might of imperialism. "American might is necessary," we read in R. Nixon's message to the Congress of 9 February 1972, "if we want to shift from an era of confrontation to an era of talks... American weakness does not contribute to the cause of peace, on the contrary it would undermine prospects for peace."¹¹ A report by the Rand Corporation (an organization which works on orders of the American military and political leadership) "Disarmament, Development and Just World Order" says that the United States "will use military force in order to prevent collapse of world order (read as: further development of revolutionary processes in the world--the author) or at least

to defend specific interests of American citizens if they are not ensured by international law." One can conclude from this premise that greater attention must be devoted to the development of doctrines, armament plans and structure of the armed forces in expectation that military force may be possibly used in some critical situations.¹²

This kind of conception, which reflected the official U.S. approach, stimulated development of duplicity in this country's foreign policy in the seventies. On the one hand American ruling circles manifested realism, which recognized the need for talks and political relaxation of international tension as regards the socialist countries, and on the other hand they were convinced that only by means of increasing military power it is possible to implement a policy of peaceful coexistence with the socialist countries. "Strong defense is a reliable way to peace," former U.S. President G. Ford said, "strength makes detente achievable."¹³ His successor as president, J. Carter, expressed himself along similar lines on 12 December 1979: "Unremitting American might--the only possible basis for a broader, a genuinely mutual relaxation of international tension which we are seeking in relations with the Soviet Union."¹⁴

Historical experience has proven graphically the illusory nature of reactionary conceptions of peaceful coexistence and relaxation of international tension. Expectations of the United States for preservation of the sociopolitical status quo in the world were not justified. During the seventies, unified socialist Vietnam was developing successfully and the peoples of Laos and Kampuchea took the path toward building a new society. Antiimperialist revolutions were victorious in Ethiopia, Angola, Nicaragua and Afghanistan and anti-shah forces in Iran. The last strongholds of fascism collapsed in Europe--in Greece, Portugal and Spain. The role in world politics of liberated countries, which raised the question of new economic order for the first time, increased and thereby dealt an appreciable blow to the neocolonialist policy of imperialism.

Contrary to the hopes of imperialist circles, detente did not lead to "softening" of the socialist system in the USSR nor to "erosion" of the socialist community. Quite the reverse, the seventies and early eighties were marked by consistent strengthening of the Soviet society's political and spiritual unity and rallying of states of developed socialism. The comprehensive program of socialist integration within the CEMA framework is being implemented at a rapid rate and the mechanism of economic, political and military cooperation of the socialist community states is being improved. These successes were especially conspicuous against the background of weakening of the traditional relations between the capitalist countries, because under the conditions of detente it is becoming more difficult for the United States to maintain its supremacy over its "junior partners."

Expectations of the U.S. ruling circles to use detente as a means for preserving the sociopolitical situation in the world and for undermining the socialist community turned out to be unsound. Detente has led to opposite results than those expected by the ruling circles of the United States and some other imperialist countries. Toward the end of the seventies, this caused a sort of "disillusionment" of the United States not only in detente but also in nonmilitary

forms of confrontation with socialism as a whole: imperialism was unable to achieve the goals it expected in political, economic and ideological spheres. As a result, in the latter part of the seventies and during the early eighties, the West and, above all, the United States strived toward activating anew the factor of military force in foreign policy and to revive power conceptions of the "cold war" period.

U.S. President G. Ford said that he refuses to use the word "detente" and suggested replacing it with the term "peace on the basis of strength."¹⁵ J. Carter, who succeeded him in this position, announced an important reappraisal of U.S. military and political strategy in a speech delivered at the Wake Forest University in March 1978. The stress of American foreign policy in it was once again placed on threats and supercharging tension.¹⁶

A noticeable hardening of the U.S. foreign policy line was reflected in the documents of the National Security Council--presidential review memorandum No 10 and presidential directive No 10, which were prepared by the Carter Administration in 1977. These documents testify to the attempts by the American leadership to stimulate the role of military force and arms race in confrontation with the Soviet Union and other socialist states and also in relations with the developing countries. It is significant that the stage in development of Soviet-American relations, which began in the mid-seventies, was interpreted in the "presidential review memorandum" as a sort of a limited "cold war" or "hot detente," when cooperation with the Soviet Union is no longer of such significance for the United States as during the first half of the seventies.¹⁷

The urge to stimulate the role of the military force factor was expressed, first of all, in a sharp intensification of the arms race and conducting of measures aimed at reviving the activity of NATO by raising the military efficiency of this bloc. In the summer of 1977, under direct pressure from the United States, the Defense Planning Committee of NATO approved directives to member countries on annual increases of military budgets by 3 percent up to 1984. The new unprecedented in scale NATO program for increasing and modernizing arms was adopted at a NATO Council session in May 1978, which was held in Washington at a level of heads of states and governments. NATO leaders sanctioned measures aimed at raising combat readiness of the bloc's armed forces, including the air force and the navy, modernizing tactical nuclear weapons and increasing the number of reserves. One and a half years later, on 12 December 1979, under flagrant pressure from Washington, ministers of foreign affairs and defense of NATO countries agreed to production and deployment of 108 launchers for Pershing-2 and 464 cruise missiles in some states in Western Europe.

The present White House leadership has taken the path of even greater hardening of the U.S. foreign policy line. From the first steps of its activity, the new administration has taken a sharp turn toward increasing "military muscles" and gaining superiority in the field of strategic offensive forces, which would allow it to act from the "position of strength." In the name of these goals military expenditures during the first year of the administration reached \$186 billion and during the second year \$226 billion. On behalf of this work is being speeded up in deployment of new intercontinental ballistic systems and construction of nuclear missile submarines, a new strategic bomber and a nuclear "super aircraft carrier"; development of laser and space weapons is being stepped up,

production of chemical weapons is being expanded and decisions are being adopted on full-scale production of neutron weapons. All of these measures are accompanied by frankly warlike statements to the effect that "peace is not the most important" and that "war is not the most terrible," which are clearly calculated at intimidating the Soviet Union and other socialist community countries and putting pressure on them from the "position of strength." Behind these statements is a desire of the U.S. imperialism to break loose from "mutual restraint," which resulted from the establishment of a military balance between the USSR and the United States, and to ensure itself the ability to inflict the first nuclear strike against the territory of the Soviet Union.¹⁸ "All of this taken together," noted D. F. Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense, "cannot be appraised otherwise than a program of preparing for a general nuclear war."¹⁹

The course toward acquiring the ability of inflicting the first nuclear strike was reflected in the officially adopted conception by the U.S. Administration on "limited strategic nuclear war," which was under development by it for several years and gained a "presidential status" in the notorious "directive No 59." Oriented even to a greater degree, than this directive, toward the first nuclear strike is the so-called "new military strategy" of the United States, which was described by Pentagon chief C. Weinberger as a strategy of "direct confrontation" between the United States and the USSR on a global and regional scale. According to his statement, it has as its goal the achievement of "complete and incontestable" military superiority over the USSR, restoration of the "United State's leading role in the world" and counteraction against the Soviet Union "in defending of own vital interests" in various regions of the world as well as "loosening the socialist community." ²⁰

The component part of the new military strategy of the United States--the conception of "active counteraction"--provides for multivariant use of strategic nuclear forces: from the so-called limited nuclear strikes to their mass use against the entire complex of objects in the territory of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community--and is oriented toward victory in a nuclear war.

This approach was stated in a recently publicized secret report of the Pentagon and the U.S. National Security Council "Directives in the field of defense for the 1984-88 fiscal years," according to which "nuclear war is recognized as inevitable and if it occurs the United States must be able to gain an upper hand over the Soviet Union." This document places responsibility on the U.S. Armed Forces to develop plans for defeating the Soviet Union at any level of a nuclear conflict. The nuclear strategy formulated in it is aimed so that the United States is able to "make the entire military and political structures of the USSR and its allies ineffective" and destroy "nuclear and nonnuclear armed forces and industrial objects of significance from the standpoint of military power."

Special stress in the "directives" is laid on preparation of protracted, long nuclear war. In case of such a war, the Pentagon provides that the American nuclear forces "must repossess and force the Soviet Union to rapidly cease military activities on conditions favorable to the United States." ²¹

In the latter part of November 1982, the U.S. Administration took a new dangerous step on the path to preparations for a nuclear war. President Reagan informed the Congress of his decision to deploy 100 new MX intercontinental ballistic missiles, which are regarded by the Pentagon as a first strike weapon and which were described by the President himself as a means for achieving "incontestable military advantage" of the United States over the USSR, as a tool for creating the prerequisites for ensuring U.S. victory in any conflict, including a nuclear one. The planned method of basing MX missiles ("by compact group")--and Washington should know about this--contradicts one of the central positions of the Salt-1 and Salt-2 treaties: obligation not to create additional stationary launchers for intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Actually all strategic weapon systems that are currently deployed in the United States possess "counter force" parameters in the sense of hitting accuracy, speed in changing of mission and power of a nuclear charge. The course of the first strike doctrine also includes U.S. plans for moving forward to borders of the Soviet Union and other socialist community countries new medium range weapon systems, intended for fulfilling strategic missions. In browbeating its West European allies with a "Soviet threat" and forcing them into speeding up the arms race, the American ruling circles have been pursuing the same goal already for many years: to transform the European continent into a more probable potential region of a military clash between the USSR and the United States and to divert a nuclear strike from American territory. In other words, they are undertaking active efforts for the purpose of achieving the ability to practically realize the conception of "Eurostrategic war" under which it would be possible to achieve global aims without the risk of being destroyed in it themselves.

Washington's new aggressive doctrines, supported by the unrestrained arms race, testify that imperialism has not given up attempts to change the strategic balance in its favor and to solve the historic dispute between the two social systems with the help of military force. At the same time, they are striving to exercise psychological influence on socialism, first of all, on the Soviet Union. In the opinion of bourgeois strategists, the possession by NATO countries of military advantage over the Warsaw Treaty member states and the first strike ability should exercise military-psychological pressure on the opposing side and make it more "compliant."

In looking at contemporary international relations through the prism of a military power approach, the American strategists regard all countries either as potential military adversaries or as potential military allies. This explains the efforts by the American ruling circles to draw in developing countries into the orbit of their military strategic and military political influence. During the years of the Carter Administration, the United States demonstrated its wish to look at problems of relations with developing countries separately from the East-West relations, but the Reagan Administration started building its policy on assumption that the most important for the United States is opposition to the Soviet Union on any question and in any place in the world, while relations with developing countries are only a part of this global opposition.

The course of this idea includes the conception of "protracted nonnuclear war" between the USSR and the United States in the territory of primarily third, developing countries, which was formulated in the summer of 1981 by the Reagan government. Official White House representatives, as reported by the NEW YORK TIMES, said that this plan provides for a possibility of a prolonged conflict with the use of conventional arms in several regions of the world simultaneously.²²

Besides serving the "peripheral strategy," military force is needed by the United States for manipulating it in the course of East-West talks. In the American understanding the term "talks from the position of strength" means that entering talks with a comparative advantage in nuclear and conventional arms will lead to desired results for the power which is in a more advantageous position. This explains the need by the United States for improving its military potential in every possible way. For example, Reagan stated in October 1980: "The Soviet Union will show far greater readiness to conscientiously (i.e. on American terms--author) conduct talks if it will be aware that the United States is increasing its power."²³ "Strengthening the nuclear potential of our armed forces," Weinberger echoes him, "ensures us the best terms for reaching fruitful agreements with the Soviet Union in the field of arms control. During the election campaign, Reagan stressed that the United States must conduct talks with the Russians from the position of strength."²⁴

The American Administration holds on to the same point of view in relation to talks on the "Euromissiles." For example, in May 1981 in addressing NATO member countries and striving to convince them on the eve of the Rome session of the NATO Council in the necessity of confirming their decision on deployment of American medium-range missiles in Western Europe, Weinberger said that "without armed power there can be no successful agreement in the field of arms control."²⁵

The conception of talks "from the position of strength," which is being advocated by the current American Administration, reveals an obvious logical inconsistency: the declared purpose of the talks is to reduce levels of military opposition, but their prerequisite is increasing these levels. However, in this case the American ruling circles are not guided by logic at all but by specific aggressive aims of the U.S. policy: to impose "from the position of strength" on the USSR such agreements which would create favorable conditions for developing American "long term" weapon systems. The American ruling circles would like to transform the arms limitation talks into one of the levers for changing the correlation of forces in their favor and achieving military superiority over the USSR.

Many responsible political figures of the United States--E. Kennedy, M. Hatfield, L. Aspin, A. Core, (R. Downey) and others--recognize that the regular round of military rivalry, which was started by the Reagan Administration, may lead to a sharp destabilization of the strategic situation. The new turn in the arms race, which will lead to the deployment of such destabilizing systems as the MX and D-5 (missiles, which the United States intends to supply to Trident-2 submarines), may cause strengthening by both sides of their first strike potential and sharply increase the vulnerability of strategic "retaliation" forces. This, in its turn, the American political figures believe, creates a completely new strategic situation which is different from the situation in the seventies, under whose conditions each side will have greater motivating stimuli to be the first to deal a nuclear strike for fear that the enemy may do so before it does.²⁶

A new round of the arms race, therefore, objectively leads to undermining the strategic stability.

Representatives of the Reagan Administration assert that the threat of a first strike against the USSR will help rather than hinder arms limitation talks. Proceeding from this conception they advocate the deployment of the MX and Trident-2 systems, which, as they regard it themselves, are first strike means. However, such an approach is deeply unsound. This is recognized by many American political figures who come forward from realistic positions. When the muzzle of a pistol is put to the temple, they note correctly, "it only destabilizes the balance of fear in relations between the two powers" and, of course, does not promote in the least the success of disarmament talks, on the contrary it makes reaching progress at them considerably more difficult.²⁷

Attempts at power manipulation at the East-West talks as well as Washington's aggressive military strategic and interventionist doctrines speak of the hardening of the U.S. foreign policy course during the eighties and of the striving by American imperialism toward stimulating the use of military force in the current decade. This is already testified by the research of the Brookings Institution "Setting National Priorities. Agenda for the 1980's." One of the authors of this work, a former counsellor of the secretary of defense and currently an associate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, B. Kaufman, notes: "Military force is not a panacea. It will not solve all problems, which, in all probability, will arise in the next decade." And here he hurries to make a proviso: "But it... can strengthen the confidence of friends and intensify the hesitation of rivals." The military force, in Kaufman's opinion, must create a constant background for international relations and determine all other forms of interstate relations.²⁸ In this is the essence of contemporary American approach to determining the role and place of the military force in the U.S. foreign policy and in international relations as a whole.

The crisis of the imperialist power policy, which occurred during the sixties and seventies, is of a deep and irreversible character because in the final analysis it was caused by a cardinal shift in the correlation of forces between socialism and capitalism. It is no coincidence that in the early seventies imperialism was forced to make a cardinal reappraisal of the power policy and put the use of military force into much safer forms for itself. However, as indicated by subsequent events, the ruling circles of the West have done this very hesitantly and inconsistently. In particular, they gave the relaxation of international tension an especially powerful and frankly voluntaristic interpretation. As a result, serious contradictions began to arise between the power conceptions of the West and the processes of actual international life in the seventies, which, like a boomerang, hit the starting positions of Western schemes of peaceful coexistence. This led to a new crisis of the imperialist power policy. But this time the crisis was experienced not by the traditional power policy but by its modernized version of the seventies. "Disillusionment" in detente, i.e. the ability of the West to impose on the world its interpretation of detente was, in essence, an admission by imperialism of this "second" crisis.

This turn of events should have prompted the imperialist countries and, above all, the United States toward a more consistent review of "cold war" power

conceptions. However, the American ruling circles have taken the path toward increasing international tension and the arms race. The hopelessness of such attempts is obvious: all military alternatives to peaceful coexistence and relaxation of international tension have already been tried by imperialism and did not bring about anything.

It is at least naive to expect a victory in a nuclear war under the contemporary situation of military-strategic balance between the East and the West. It is ridiculous to presume that the side opposing the United States would agree to some sort of "rules of the game" that are advantageous only to the aggressor: for example, to "guarantee" that in response to an attack it will not use other, more powerful types of weapons. Just as absurd is the American idea that a nuclear war, in the event it begins, may be "limited" within the bounds of some single region, specifically Europe. It is quite obvious that a "Eurostrategic war" can easily shift across the ocean and hit the country which unleashes it. If a nuclear war begins, be it in Europe or in another place, it would unavoidably and inevitably acquire a worldwide character. Under conditions of a global nuclear war, as recognized by political figures of the West themselves already during the sixties, there can be no victory. How can one seriously expect a victory in such a war if its consequences are in essence unpredictable? It is clear that such expectations are obviously doomed to failure. From the rostrum of the 26th CPSU Congress, the Soviet Union confirmed once more: "Attempts to overcome one another in an arms race and expect to win in a nuclear war--this is a dangerous folly." 29

The policy of achieving military superiority is no less adventuristic. Under contemporary conditions its result may not be a breach of parity in favor of the United States but only its reproduction at a much higher technological level. This is recognized by many competent persons in the West. "The USSR leaders," wrote former Ambassador to Moscow T. Watson, "have the possibilities as well as means to withstand any of our increases in arms. The only thing that we will achieve will be useless expenditures of needed funds and intensification of danger of an accidental nuclear confrontation. Like it or not, we must admit that the USSR will not agree to the status of a second powerful state." 30

In our time, imperialism does not have military, economic or political possibilities for turning back to the strategy of the fifties. The correlation of forces in the world has changed. Mankind has accumulated a great and valuable experience of detente which has shown in reality the possibility and expediency of solving difficult international problems through negotiations. In the Western camp itself there has been no feeling for a long time to blindly follow all the zigzags of Washington's foreign policy. And even in the United States itself there are growing forces which are coming forward against increasing international tension and for normalizing Soviet-American relations and mutually advantageous cooperation. Let us even take as an example the unprecedented for its scale present antiwar movement in the United States, which united during the 1980-83 period under the slogan for freezing nuclear arsenals.

A growing contribution to the struggle for peace and to the elimination and prevention of critical situations is being made by the nonalignment movement whose participants have declared a policy of nonparticipation in military blocs and refusal to make their territory available for military bases. In this manner this movement has limited to a considerable degree imperialism's opportunity to use military force

As emphasized by CPSU Central Committee general secretary Yu. V. Andropov, the USSR "repudiates the standpoint of those who are attempting to suggest to people that as if power and weapons solve and will always solve everything. Today, people are moving as never before to the foreground of history. They have acquired the right to vote which cannot be stifled by anyone. Through active and purposeful activities, they are capable of eliminating the threat of a nuclear war and preserve peace and, this also means, life on our planet."31

The objective, independent of the will of present American leaders limitation of possibilities for pursuing a policy "from the position of strength," connected with the irreversible processes of a social and scientific and technical character, leads to the conclusion of the hopelessness of hardening of the U.S. foreign policy course during the eighties. Obviously, the attempts to revive power conceptions of the "cold war" and to introduce them into actual world policy of the current decade may turn out to be only a new, a greater cruel historic defeat for imperialism.

The present U.S. Administration continues to tread an extremely perilous path. "The issues of war and peace," Yu. V. Andropov stressed in this connection in his replies to questions put by a PRAVDA correspondent, "must not be treated so lightly. All attempts at achieving military superiority over the USSR are futile. The Soviet Union will never allow that to happen. It will never be caught defenseless by any threat. Let there be no doubt on this score in Washington. It is time it stopped thinking up more and more ways of unleashing a nuclear war in the hope of winning it. To do this is not just irresponsible, it is madness." 32

This is why the CPSU and the Soviet government are forced to devote unremitting attention to further strengthening of the country's defense capacity and to maintaining the combat readiness of the Soviet Armed Forces at a proper level. It is precisely the military potential of the USSR and other socialist states which blocks the action of laws, immanently characteristic of imperialism. The socialist military might—a decisive condition for restraining the aggressive tendencies and aspirations of world imperialism. The militaristic course and aggressive policy of the NATO bloc headed by the United States forces the USSR to adopt measures for maintaining the country's defense capacity at a proper level. This is a cruel necessity of today's world, which, of course, requires diversion of much funds. But the Soviet Union is not spending and will not spend for this purposes a single ruble above that which is absolutely necessary for ensuring security of the Soviet people and their friends and allies. They see the future not in unlimited accumulation of arms but in reaching reasonable understanding with the other side on mutual reduction in the level of military opposition.

"We believe," Yu. V. Andropov stresses, "that the difficulties and tension, which characterize today's international situation, can and must be overcome. Mankind cannot reconcile itself endlessly with the arms race and wars if it does not want to stake its future. The CPSU is against a dispute of ideas being transformed into a confrontation between states and peoples, against weapons and readiness to use them becoming a measure of potentials of social systems." 33

The Soviet Union confirms its appeal for preservation of peace with concrete foreign policy actions. Its coming forward during the difficult period in international relations with responsible initiatives is permeated with concern for peace, a desire to eliminate the threat of a nuclear war. They are an organic continuation and consistent development of the Soviet peace program for the eighties. Its implementation—a road to peace and security on earth, exclusion of military force from the practice of international relations.

FOOTNOTES

1. Y. Azrael, R. Lowental, T. Nakagava "An Overview of East-West Relations," the Trilateral Commission, New York-Tokyo-Paris, 1977; Blechman B., Kaplan S. "Force without War Armed Forces as a Political Instrument," Washington, 1978; "Grand Strategy for the 1980's," Washington, 1978; "The Triangle Papers," 1978, No 15; "Setting National Priorities. Agenda for the 1980's," Washington, 1980; "National Security in the 1980's: from Weakness to Strength," San Francisco, 1980.
2. The American researchers who reflect most adequately the views of the U.S. military-political leadership include: H. Kissinger, S. Hoffman, T. Schelling, S. Brown, B. Brody, D. Garnett, R. Oldridge, V. Kaufman, M. Klaud, R. Kalf, B. Rasset, R. Klein, M. Kaplan, G. Koffi, K. Norr, G. Spenier, K. Tucker, O. Holsti, G. Rozenau. Another group of American scientists, who are directly engaged in military strategy problems, consists of professional U.S. military personnel and military experts and specialists in the field of military-strategic research. Among them in particular are: B. Holloway, E. Zamuolt, G. Collins, B. Palmer, T. Milton, M. Carry, W. Rouz, M. Taylor, H. Baldwin, R. Osgood, D. Kruzel, B. Blechman, R. Berman, R. Binkin, R. Weyland.
3. The following works should be especially noted: "Voyennaya Sila i Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya" [Military Force and International Relations], Moscow, 1972; G. A. Trofimenko, "SShA: Voyna, Politika, Ideologiya" [United States: War, Politics, Ideology], Moscow, 1976; "Voyna i Armiya" [War and the Army], Moscow, 1977; "Vneshnepoliticheskiye Kontseptsii SShA" [Foreign Policy Conceptions of the United States], Moscow, 1979; V. F. Petrovskiy, "Doktrina 'Natsional'noy Bezopasnosti' v Global'noy Strategii SShA" [The Doctrine of 'National Security' in the U.S. Global Strategy], Moscow, 1980; "SShA: Voyenno-Strategicheskiye Kontseptsii" [United States: Military-Strategic Concepts], Moscow, 1980; "Otkuda Iskhodit Ugroza Miru" [Whence is the Threat to Peace], Moscow, 1982; N. V. Ogarkov, "Na Strazhe Mirnogo Truda" [On Guard of Peaceful Labor], Moscow, 1982.
4. H. Kahn, B. Bruce-Briggs "Things to Come," New York, 1972, pp 123-124; B. Russel "Power and Community in World Politics," San Francisco, 1974, p 47.
5. A. Geogres, R. Smoke "Deterrence and American Foreign Policy," New York, 1974, p 591.
6. PRAVDA, 30 May 1972.

7. Th. Garnett (Ed), "Theories of Peace and Security," New York, 1970, p 81.
8. INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 28 Apr 1975.
9. PRAVDA, 10 Oct 1979.
10. W. Kintner, "Peace and Strategy Conflict," New York, 1967, p 81.
11. "United States Foreign Policy for 1970's. The Emerging Structure of Peace," a report by President R. Nixon, February 9 1972, Washington, 1972, p 155.
12. "Disarmament, Development and Just World," New Delhi, 1972, pp 9-10.
13. "Sea Power," Vol 18, No 15, Washington, 1975, p 10.
14. THE NEW YORK TIMES, 13 Dec 1979.
15. "Strategic Survey," London, 1977, p 41.
16. Carter's speech at the Wake Forest University: Official text, 11 Apr 1978.
17. THE NEW YORK TIMES, 12 Jul 1977.
18. U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 29 Dec 1980, 5 Jan 1981.
19. PRAVDA, 7 Dec 1982.
20. N. V. Ogarkov, "Vsegda v Gotovnosti k Zashchite Otechestva" [Always Ready to Defend the Fatherland], Moscow, 1982, p 16.
21. THE NEW YORK TIMES, 31 May 1982. Also see PRAVDA, 18 Jan 1983; IZVESTIYA 21 Jan 1983.
22. THE NEW YORK TIMES, 14 Apr 1981.
23. FIGARO, 27 Oct 1980.
24. THE WASHINGTON POST, 29 Jan 1981.
25. AVIATION WEEK AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY, 30 Apr 1981.
26. "Freeze! How You Can Help Prevent Nuclear War," Ed. by E. Kennedy, M. Hatfield, New York, 1982, pp 131-133.
27. THE WASHINGTON POST, 2 Jan 1983.
28. "Setting National Priorities. Agenda for the 1980's," p 293.
29. "Materialy XXVI S'yezda KPSS" [Materials on the 26th CPSU Congress], p 23.
30. THE NEW YORK TIMES, 19 Jan 1981.

31. PRAVDA, 23 Nov 1982.

32. PRAVDA, 27 Mar 1983.

33. PRAVDA, 23 Nov 1982.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Novaya i noveyshaya istoriya", 1983.

9817

CSO: 1807/284

BOOK ON DOMESTIC POLITICS OF U.S. 'TURN TO CONFRONTATION' REVIEWED

Moscow NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA No 3, May-Jun 83 pp 189-191

[Review by R. F. Ivanov of book "SShA: Za Fasadom Global'noy Politiki" [United States: Behind the Facade of Global Politics] (the internal factors in the formation of American imperialism's foreign policy on the eve of the eighties) by A. A. Kokoshin, Moscow, Mysl' Publishing House, 1981, 367 pages]

[Text] There is always a close interdependence between the domestic and foreign politics of any state. This well known position of V. I. Lenin is convincingly confirmed by the postwar history of the United States.* The work by Doctor of Historical Sciences A. A. Kokoshin, chief of a department of the Institute of the United States and Canada of the USSR Academy of Sciences, is devoted to analyzing the entire complex of domestic factors, which influenced the formation of American imperialism's foreign policy during the seventies-eighties. It was precisely at this time that a sharp aggravation of international tension occurred, which was a result of an abrupt turn to confrontation in the U.S. foreign policy course.

This turn was caused by a complex combination of objective and subjective reasons, which arose long before aggravation of international tension. So it is natural that the book examines a much broader historic period than that indicated in its title. The scientific and political significance of the problems being researched in the monograph is exceptionally important. Indeed, to correctly define the reasons of the abrupt change in the U.S. foreign policy course during the years being examined, means to create the necessary theoretical premises for taking effective action against the policy of American imperialism.

The author examines a broad range of questions: the change of U.S. international positions in the seventies and the influence of this process on the country's socioeconomic and sociopolitical life; features of the U.S. domestic political history in the seventies and their effect on the American foreign policy; the problem of domestic and foreign policy priorities during these years; the power crisis in the United States and its influence on the country's foreign policy; and the practical activity of economic, political, scientific and administrative organizations that exerts influence on the adoption and implementation of foreign policy decisions.

* V. I. Lenin, "Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy" [Complete Works], Vol 30, p 93.

This difficult complex of problems is being studied on the basis of an analysis of documents of the Congress and various governmental, political, scientific and propaganda organizations, monographic studies and articles, memoirs, the press and recordings of the author's conversations with well-known state and political figures of the United States, scientific workers and propaganda service figures.

The political structure of the United States is based on a two-party system, which is presented by the advocates of the American way of life as the height of political democracy and a model to be imitated by all countries and peoples. Relying on the works of the founders of Marxism-Leninism, the author exposes in a well-reasoned way the antidemocratic and antipopular essence of the U.S. two-party system. F. Engels wrote: "We see two large bands of political profiteers there, who alternately take possession of state power and exploit it with the aid of most dirty means and for most dirty purposes, and a nation which is helpless against these two large cartels of politicians, who are supposedly in its service but in reality are dominating and plundering it." *

The Soviet-American relations are a key question of world politics. Naturally, the author devoted great attention to the economic, military-political and other aspects of this problem.

The monograph makes a comprehensive analysis of the military, economic, political and ideological integration of the capitalist countries and at the same time shows all of the most important directions in the aggravation of contradictions between the United States and its partners in the aggressive military blocs. Corresponding parts of the work testify that no integration processes whatever can remove the problem of interimperialist contradictions. A. A. Kokoshin reveals the specifics of these contradictions in concrete historic conditions of the third stage of capitalism's overall crisis.

The work also describes consequences of the collapse of imperialism's colonial system. The work notes that this had serious consequences for the foreign policy of all imperialist countries and, above all, for the United States. A deep regrouping of forces within the world capitalist system occurred in the process of its collapse. The United States exerted much effort in order to fill the "vacuum" that was formed after the forced departure of metropolitan countries from their former colonies. It was transformed into the chief exploiter of developing countries, which faced serious problems in building economic bases of their genuine state independence.

A. A. Kokoshin traces the difficult complex of relations between the United States and the liberated countries. Particularly great attention is devoted to the energy crisis, which acquired during the years being examined a clear tendency toward developing into a crisis of raw material resources.

An important place in the work is occupied by the analysis of problems connected with critical phenomena in socioeconomic and sociopolitical development of the

*K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, Vol 22, p 200.

United States and their influence on the country's foreign policy. The author proves that the hopes of the U.S. ruling circles were not justified at all that the scientific-technical revolution would be a panacea for all evils which face the American society. American reality testifies that no scientific-technical progress whatever can change the cyclic character of economic development in the capitalist countries and prevent the development of cyclic and structural crises and impoverishment of the broad workers masses. A. A. Kokoshin describes the worsening of racial problems in the United States, the problems of cities and the growth of mass movements, particularly of the strike and trade union movement.

The monograph devotes great attention to domestic and foreign policy problems connected with the strategic arms race, which is carried out by the U.S. ruling circles.

Of course, not all foreign and domestic policy problems of the United States that are being researched in the book are elucidated with equal completeness and at the same scientific and theoretical level. Specifically, in our opinion, in analyzing the reasons of the turn to the the right of the American foreign policy course during the seventies-eighties (pp 3, 336, 338, 339 and other) it would have been desirable to dwell on the aspects connected with the bilateral character of detente as a political phenomenon. In analyzing mass movements in the United States, which influence the foreign policy of American imperialism, attention should have been devoted to special features of the Negro movement during those years.

The monograph contains extensive factual material, which will be of interest to specialists who are studying the history of the United States. Its value consists, first of all, in the analysis and generalization of complex phenomena in the domestic and foreign policy history of the United States during the seventies-eighties.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Novaya i noveyshaya istoriya", 1983

9817

CSO: 1807/284

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

Aug 24, 1983